



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Bernini

Citation for published version:

Warwick, G 2012, *Bernini: Art as Theatre*. Yale University Press, London & New Haven.

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Bernini

Art as Theatre

Genevieve Warwick

For my parents

Contents

Acknowledgements	ooo
Introduction: Art, Theatre, Illusion	ooo
1 Palace Scenographies	ooo
2 Theatres of Piety	ooo
3 Pastorals	ooo
4 Fountain and Festival	ooo
5 The Performance of Practice	ooo
Notes	ooo
Bibliography	ooo
Index	ooo

Acknowledgements

In the course of writing this book I have accrued many debts, both intellectual and institutional. It is a pleasure to acknowledge them here. I enjoyed support in the form of leave through grants from the Leverhulme Trust, and the Arts and Humanities Research Council. The Henry Moore Foundation, the Arts and Humanities Research Council and the Carnegie Trust supported the heavy costs of photographic illustrations.

This book began in an MA class I taught at the Courtauld; my thanks to the successive cohorts of students who helped me to flesh out my earliest thoughts on the subject. Along the way, while conducting the research and writing, I gained immeasurably from resources and colleagues at a number of research institutions and libraries: the Académie de France à Rome, the American Academy in Rome, the Bibliotheca Hertziana, the British School at Rome, the Courtauld Institute of Art, the Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities at the University of Edinburgh, the Villa I Tatti and the Warburg Institute. Most of the best conversations I had about the development of this book occurred under their auspices. I also profited greatly from opportunities to present aspects of this work as conference and seminar papers in numerous institutions, notably the National Gallery of Scotland, the Villa Medici, the Victoria and Albert Museum, and the Zentral Institut für Kunstgeschichte in Munich; my thanks to the organisers and to those who listened, questioned, criticised and engaged with me. Thanks also to all those scholars of the Roman *Seicento*, Bernini, and Baroque sculpture in particular, who so generously shared their knowledge with me.

I was fortunate to publish earlier versions of this work in a number of journals and anthologies, for which I thank particularly the editors of *Art History* and the art-historical publications of the Académie de France à Rome. I also warmly thank my readers for press for their thoughtful interventions, as well as the guiding hand of my editor at Yale University Press, Gillian Malpass, and her editorial staff. Finally, my heartfelt thanks to my family for their good humour, tolerance and support while I wrote this book. In many ways this study grew out of my memories of attending a performing arts school, immersed in the illusions of performance. I hope that my writing can convey something of that engagement with theatre's craft.

Introduction:

Art, Theatre, Illusion

Above the altar rail where the praying suppliant kneels, the entrance arch to Bernini's Cornaro chapel is festooned with angels and cherubim of white stucco ornament (fig. 1). At the base, adult angels in a rhythm of *contrapposto* poses hold open books towards which they gesture with their hands. Above them hover the bodies of winged cherubs in high relief. Their dangling limbs protruding into the physical space of the chapel dissolve the gilt-painted ground to which they adhere into a field of illusion. Angels at the height of the arch carry a banderole bearing an inscription: 'Nisi coelum creassem ob te solam crearem' ('If I had not created heaven I would create it for you alone'), God's words to the chapel's dedicatory saint, Teresa.¹ Beyond, the vault of the chapel is transformed into an illusionistic opening onto a heavenly sky. The lower fields of white- and gilt-painted stucco are composed of relief scenes narrating the life of Teresa, while the upper reaches of their frames are obscured by a mantle of clouds that seem to enter the chapel from above. These clouds, which bear music-making angels, in fact compose a further layer of painted stucco that projects over the narrative wall panels, overlapping the actual architectural frame of the window and even encroaching onto its stained-glass border. In the rapid pen lines of a surviving preparatory sketch, the window frame seems to float among clouds; here we see Bernini striving to effect a full confusion of fictive and architectural space (fig. 2). This is the ceiling's conceit. From the centre of its stucco field an aureole of light works illusionistically to dissolve the physical ground on which it is painted, transforming the vault into an opening onto the heavens marked by the descent of a dove as emblem of the godhead.

To turn back to the chapel's entrance arch: its flying cherubs are not merely at play. They weave flower garlands onto the architectural framework of the arch, delineating its borders (fig. 3). With this detail Bernini doubled the chapel's illusionistic deceit. The cherubs become as if heavenly architects of this celestial vision; at the same time the stucco garlands imitate the temporary wooden structures built to decorate churches on ritual occasions, ornamented with floral arrangements. Thus the space of the chapel is an artful fiction both of the heavens and of the ephemeral scenographies of religious theatre. Its *mise-en-abyme* is manifest in the threshold of the frame, the entrance arch. The chapel's art is both 'absorbed' and 'self-aware', to borrow in turn from Michael Fried and Victor Stoichita.² This reflexive doubling of artistic illusion, the 'play within a play' of Bernini's sculptural *mise-en-scène*, may serve to adumbrate the trajectory across Baroque art taken in this book.³

Art as Theatre

[I]t should surprise no one that a man so excellent in the three arts [of design] . . . as Bernini also possessed to a great degree the fine gift of composing plays both

excellent and ingenious, because it springs from the same genius, fruit of the same vivacity and wit.⁴

Seventeenth-century accounts of Bernini's life and work all accord in detailing not only the artist's great works of sculpture and architecture but also his career-long engagement with the ephemeral arts of theatre.⁵ Little remains of this aspect of Bernini's oeuvre compared to the sculptural and architectural works that properly dominate art-historical discussion. Yet theatre historians recognise Bernini's pivotal position to the history of this Baroque art, notwithstanding the fugitive nature of the material evidence. He was in turn actor, director and scenographer, producing plays both in his own premises and in the palaces of Rome's great papal families, as well as designing myriad temporary scenographies for the elaborately staged Baroque ceremonies of church and court.⁶

To draw together Bernini's art with theatre is to situate his work at the heart of Baroque cultural production. Indeed it was an abiding trope of the time that 'all the world's a stage'. In light of this, Filippo Baldinucci's intimation of an equivalence between the realms of theatre and sculpture in Bernini's art, quoted above, takes on a heightened significance. Baldinucci perceived the channels of transfer between Bernini's sculptural and theatrical art as founded in an inter-medial exchange between these two art forms. This book builds on Baldinucci's critical premise. In architecture, sculpture and theatre alike Bernini forged an art of illusion, that hallmark of the Baroque. Thus Baldinucci prefaced his discussion of Bernini's theatrical work with a broader consideration of illusionism as founded in a conjunction between the visual and dramatic arts:

He who said that poetry is painting that speaks, and conversely that painting is mute poetry, spoke well. But if such a description fits poetry in general, it is yet more suited to that type of poetry called dramatic. In such representation, as in a beautiful painted narrative, we perceive various characters of diverse ages, circumstances and customs, each with their own air and actions proper to themselves, with an excellent distribution of colour that, like the voices of a choir, forms a beautiful and marvellous composition.⁷

Baldinucci's consideration of the relationship between art and theatre in Bernini's work sprang from the Horatian topos of *ut pictura poesis* and the longstanding coupling of painting and poetry as sister arts. Yet he moved quickly from a text-image analogy to comparison between the visual and dramatic arts, in keeping with poetry's long history of oral performance, and in order to associate Bernini's art with theatrical illusion.⁸ His critical legacy guides this book's enquiry into relations between art, theatre and illusion in Bernini's sculptural work.

* * *

In the preface to *Bernini and the Unity of the Visual Arts* of 1980, Irving Lavin began with a discussion of what he termed Bernini's 'sham'. With this phrase he alluded to the material and technical means of Bernini's art of illusion, which he understood as founded in a medial unification of architecture, sculpture and painting.⁹ The relations between media that Lavin brought to prominence surely drew on deeper critical roots within the discipline, the mantle of Wölfflin and Riegl's project to discern structural

commonalities or conformities of Baroque style across painting, architecture and sculpture together. Lavin's interest lay in the interrelationships of different media in Bernini's chapel decoration, and specifically those points of convergence in which one medium took on characteristics of another in a 'sham' of materials. In congruent form he closed the book with an account of Bernini's stage sets, which he recognised as an arena where the artist similarly deployed an array of different media in pursuit of a unified fiction.¹⁰ Yet he concluded by disclaiming the significance of this connection. Likewise, Rudolf Wittkower's magisterial monograph on the artist of 1955 had raised the question of Bernini and theatre, only to reject the perceived implication of a 'theatrical' art with its critical connotations of 'sham'.¹¹

Such caution in confronting analogies between art and theatre in analyses of the Baroque has permeated its twentieth-century scholarship. This was surely due to a formalist art criticism constructed within paradigms of modernism, which used the term 'theatrical' as a critical negative to denote an apparent casuistry against which the emergence of modern art defined itself. This in turn drew on the radical reinvention of 'theatre' as 'performance' in the work and writings of practitioners such as Antonin Artaud and Bertolt Brecht, who in different ways sought to shatter the 'false reality' of nineteenth-century theatrical illusion severed from life by the proscenium arch. Formalist criticism similarly cast Baroque art and its genealogies as histrionic casuistry, its illusions as empty. In this regard it is striking to compare Bernini's critical reception across the twentieth century with that of Caravaggio. Construed as a progenitor of modernism by Roger Fry, Caravaggio was cut from the historical circumstances that produced his art to inaugurate instead a teleology of modernism. Freed from the mesh of context, Caravaggio's work was seen to embody the 'realism' of performance in contrast to Baroque theatricality's empty illusions.¹² Caravaggio has continued to attract critical perspectives from beyond the realm of *seicento* studies; Bernini scholarship, by contrast, remains more limited to scholars within the field.¹³ The thrust of this scholarship has been to contextualise individual monuments from Bernini's oeuvre within the world of their making, and to grant the artist critical acclaim according to the measure of his time, which he dominated to an unprecedented degree.¹⁴ If the epithet 'theatrical' lingers on, it has presented something of a critical embarrassment. Within the field of Bernini studies the analogy with theatre was largely dropped, regarded as too awkward to engage with. His work in theatre has been applied to analysis of his art warily if at all, part of a more widespread reluctance to mine the seam of interrelationships between art and theatre in the study of the Baroque.¹⁵

At a broader level the comparison between Baroque art and theatre persists, however, seemingly because it refers to some critical quality of the work that we recognise.¹⁶ The trajectories of this book across the conjoined terrain of seventeenth-century art and theatre thus seek to redefine this equivalence by historicised means. Its conclusions are, ultimately, specific to the study of Bernini. Nonetheless, this artist's own direct engagement with theatre, coupled with his dominance in the development of a new artistic language of illusion, may make of him a synecdoche for Baroque art more broadly.

In fact, to separate Bernini's art work from his engagement with theatre is to sever it from the cultures that produced it no less forcefully than Fry did Caravaggio's. Across his career Bernini's art unfolded fully immersed in Baroque cultures of

performance in theatre and in ritual form. To shift again between the specificities of Bernini's work and those of broader paradigms, seventeenth-century European cultural history is distinctive for its production of a rich plethora of performance genres. With hindsight we recognise the emergence of the operatic form in Italy and of classical ballet in France during Bernini's lifetime. These generic divisions were then fluid, however, the different genres seeding themselves through fusions with older performance cultures of church and court – *sacre rappresentazioni*, festivals, the arts attending dynastic marriages and funerals, and a host of less distinct forms of enactment that constituted part of the rituals of faith and state.¹⁷ It was also a particularly rich period in the history of scenography, heralding significant developments in the staging and rapid changing of sets that brought new technologies to theatre's arts of illusion.¹⁸ Such sets were commonly orchestrated by artists, often major figures like Bernini. To lose this cognate history from scholarly view was to shield Bernini and the Baroque from the critical accusation of an empty casuistry, but severed this art from a contextualised history of its cultural production.

Arts of Occasion

In part, the troubled critical history of Baroque 'sham' has turned around the vexed use of the term 'theatre'. Since the beginning of the twentieth century the term has been reconstructed in binary opposition to a definition of performance by those engaged with the new discipline of performance studies. Theatre seen through a proscenium arch was regarded as staging illusory worlds, now regarded as sophistry, into which viewers fictively 'entered' through a process of false identification, and were thereby reduced to passivity as spectators. Twentieth-century performance genres, often marked by the absence of a physical separation between 'actors' and 'audience', usually sought to enact a happening rather than to re-present an encapsulated narrative, and to rebind its viewers as participants through an immediacy of reception akin to social experience.¹⁹

These twentieth-century critical alignments do not translate onto the historical landscape of seventeenth-century performance cultures, notwithstanding some apparent terminological congruities over time. While the term 'theatre' – *teatro* – was used throughout the early modern period in an architectural/spatial sense, even in this context its significance was fluid, and different from our own. Purpose-built permanent theatre buildings only emerged in the second half of the seventeenth century. Earlier performances were staged in temporary wooden 'theatres' assembled for the occasion in large reception rooms, courtyards or other substantial spaces. Thus the term 'theatre', derived from Rome's ancient amphitheatres, could indicate a temporary scenographic construction, or a space used for recitals within aristocratic palaces and villa gardens, or a place for occasional devotion within a church, or simply an ornamented space used for social spectacles in private residences or city squares.²⁰ It was not used directly to signify a type of performance or play.

Moreover, what we would now identify as 'theatre' in the sense of the enactment of a play or other type of performance did not occur in isolation. Rather, the performance of plays and recitals formed part of larger social or ritual composites, often extending over several days and including feasts, banquets, devotions, processions or

masked balls: the civic festivals of diplomatic entries; the high holy days of the church calendar, comprising not only sacred theatre but, by inversion, also the comedies of the Carnival season; noble births, deaths and marriages; as well as myriad smaller events tied to aristocratic social occasions or religious festivals. Thus early modern 'theatre' was an art of occasion, deeply embedded within larger cultural and ritual events where the boundaries between formal and social performance, between 'actors' and 'audience', were porous. It better approximates the anthropological sense of the term 'political theatre' brought to prominence by Clifford Geertz for its ability to encompass an array of cultural enactments and their interrelationships. Likewise, early modern theatre remained embedded in 'lived experience', still densely woven into the fabric of ritual and social life.²¹

Our knowledge of seventeenth-century theatrical performances is derived from written descriptions and prints, but also from the material remains of otherwise ephemeral scenographies – ritual and devotional objects, as well as the decorative arts of palace interiors. Among the most influential strands of recent scholarship on Roman Baroque sculpture has been Jennifer Montagu's emphasis on the decorative arts for court festivals and church liturgy.²² Bernini's oeuvre is archetypal in encompassing everything from the colonnade of St Peter's, to ornamental carriage finials. The decorative arts that remain to us constitute the physical traces of much vaster, largely ephemeral visual cultures, from which permanent art often drew its forms and its cultural force. These comprised not only decorative and ephemeral arts, but also various kinds of cultural performance. Thus we may situate seventeenth-century 'theatre' within a larger firmament of ritual acts and objects. In this we have a key by which to re-enter the problematic terrain of Bernini's 'theatricality'. To understand the decorative arts as fabricated for the 'theatre' of church and court is to point to Aby Warburg's contention that permanent works of art are the survivors of much larger material cultures of ephemera now largely lost to us. To bring them back into view is to recall the web of culture out of which these objects issued and in which their forms were rooted. To Warburg, Renaissance art was, in its inception, an art of occasion, made for ritual and festival use. The fecundity of its visual languages rested on its ability to draw on the wellsprings of ritual life, constantly renewing itself through this exchange. Out of this much more extensive realm of ephemeral visual cultures Warburg drew what he termed 'intermediary forms', what he saw as bridges or links between works of art and 'life'.²³ We may complicate this model of the intermediary form by understanding it within the interlaced web of an 'histoire croisée'.²⁴ Warburg's channels of cultural transfer between the arts encompassed temporary scenographies as well as decorative art forms. In terms of fabrication, these occasional and temporary displays were often made from the same materials, using the same techniques, as preparatory works for permanent objects of sculpture and architecture – wax, clay, gesso, stucco and wood. Thus the two converged within the artist's working process. The paradigm of the 'intermediary form' also included bodily languages of performance and ritual action, those mimetic gestures that marked a first stage in the translation of life into art for Warburg.

If the relationship between Bernini's art and his theatre has been relatively neglected, the rich interplay between his work for the church and the ephemeral decorative forms of Catholic ritual has not. In fact, it is his art for the Catholic church, both at St Peter's and in his chapel decorations, that has led the literature. Bernini often served

the church in its arts of occasion; scholars of ephemera document his involvement with such temporary ritual forms across his career.²⁵ More recently, scholarship has suggested an additional, courtly genesis for Bernini's famed universality in art as in scenography.²⁶ Court artists commonly mounted temporary 'stage sets' according to social occasion, composed of various ephemeral media – wood, stucco, paint. The fabrication of these court scenographies, like the objects of religious ritual decoration, proved rich sources of invention within the Baroque artist's workshop. Here too we may trace Bernini's protean ability to work across all media in the construction of *mises-en-scène* for court entertainments as well as religious theatre.

This book encompasses Bernini's work for church and court together, regarding them as distinct yet densely interwoven spheres in which his art may be said to have performed. It also considers together the two strands of Bernini's work in theatre that are generally acknowledged in the sources as instrumental to his art-making: gestural language and scenographic effects. These two may converge in a broader discussion of art as illusion. Together they forged an art apparently live like theatre. The first, the resemblance to a performing body, was concerned with the rendering of lifelike figures, 'liveliness' coupled to a seeming lifelikeness on which it depended. The second, scenography, was bound to the artistic fiction of imaginary spaces. These two inter-related tropes of Baroque art's illusions – moving figures and fictive spaces – run through my analysis. Both tie this art to its broader historical contingencies, to Baroque culture's quest for illusion in art as in theatre.²⁷ The Baroque artist strove to effect this through technologies of visual illusion, using them to forge the semblance of life in art. If intellectual historians have defined the Baroque as an 'age of wonder', literary historians have noted the period's sense of the marvellous. In the words of the great seventeenth-century poet Giambattista Marino: 'È del poeta il fin la meraviglia.'²⁸ In the visual arts this marvellous wonder lay in the realm of illusion, paradoxically the seeming presence of life. As Baldinucci reported Bernini to have said, 'Art lies in that which is all illusion, yet appears true.'²⁹

The Language of Gesture

Bernini made a portrait of [Pedro de Foix Montoya] so lifelike that all who saw it were stupefied. When the work was put *in situ* many cardinals and other prelates came to the church [of San Giacomo degli Spagnoli] in order to see this fine work. One among them said: 'This is Montoya petrified.' The words were no sooner spoken than Montoya himself appeared. Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, later Urban VIII . . . went to greet him and, touching him, said: 'This is the portrait of Monsignor Montoya.' Then, turning to the bust, he pronounced: 'And this is Monsignor Montoya.'³⁰

This biographical anecdote of the reception of Bernini's early portrait of the Spanish prelate Montoya (fig. 4; now in Santa Maria di Monserrato), stands as a leitmotif of its literary genre. The story turns on a full confusion between the live model and its likeness in effigy. Like the painted grapes by the ancient artist Zeuxis, so fully illusionistic that birds pecked at them,³¹ it is testament to the artist's skill in the *technè* of illusion. Specifically, the story understands artistic production in terms of a metamorphic transformation of material: stone into flesh, flesh into stone, a living resemblance forged from the matter of marble.

Bernini's son Domenico recounted another story that, like the apparent confusion of life and art surrounding Montoya's portrait, similarly situates Bernini's work at the threshold of veristic illusion, as if by a kind of magic. Urban VIII, having been ill, appeared at the window of the Vatican to assure the people of his recovery. Wags in the crowd said it was the pope's corpse, given life and movement by means of Bernini's artifice.³² In this account, Bernini miraculously brings the inanimate to life, to endow the effigy with the semblance of movement.

In both stories the heart of illusion is seen to lie in the mimetic rendering of the human body, the artist's skill in wresting art forms out of life. Conversely, much of the critical reception of Bernini's sculpture in his day turned around the fiction of Pygmalion, of stone figures stirring into life. If Montoya himself is petrified by Bernini's art, his portrait takes on the semblance of the animate. This criticism hinges on an understanding of the object and its model as doubled. In a similar vein contemporary commentary on Bernini's work in theatre dwelt on the skill of the acting, praising above all its 'naturalism'. Paul Fréart de Chantelou's opening description of the artist in his diary of Bernini's trip to France pertinently included discussion of his acting skill: 'He is an excellent speaker, with a particular talent for expressing things through word, expression and gesture, making these visible just as the great painters have done with their brushes. This is doubtless the reason for his success in putting on plays.'³³

Giovan Battista Doni, literary figure of the Barberini entourage, similarly described the action in Bernini's plays as 'lively and lifelike', 'played with lively and expressive action'.³⁴ The quest for lifelikeness that this book traces in Bernini's sculpture lay also at the heart of his theatre. While his work as a sculptor led him to give the semblance of life to inanimate matter, his medium in theatre was live, that of the actor's body. Yet both endeavours shared an engagement with mimesis: to rehearse the acting body in order to find the most affective gestures, a corporeal language that could 'speak', like the pose of the artist's model. In Warburg's terms the actor's poses marked the first steps into the figural stylisations of art.

The story of an imagined effigy of the pope given life and movement by Bernini's art recalls also the ritual effigies of *ex voto* traditions. These wax, plaster and clay funeral masks were modelled by imprint on the features of the corpse to capture, paradoxically, a lifelike resemblance.³⁵ The memory of ritual movement and gesture, understood as miraculously 'entering into' Bernini's art, is implicit in the anecdote. The bodily demeanour of ceremony, still within the fabric of social life yet rendered into ritualised signifying gestures, like theatre constituted an intermediary step between lived experience and artistic form. In theatre the process of rehearsal is the means by which the acting body finds the most eloquent gestural language in order to signify its affective meaning. In ritual this process occurs over much longer periods of time, bound within collective memories of its historical repetition. By this means its significant gestures both evoke and invoke a parallel embodied mimesis on the part of its participants.³⁶ Thus ritual gestures become crystallised, intensified forms that signify collective affects. Into this quest for those poses possessed of the greatest cultural resonance in both theatre and ritual we may interpolate also the canons of art and Bernini's long study of antique sculpture.³⁷ The history of antiquity's legacy of affective gestures and poses was, for him, a repertoire of visual forms on which he drew across his career. These in turn derived their resonance from longstanding conventions of giving permanent artistic form to a gestural language drawn from ritual acts. It is

within these interwoven visual histories of bodily expression, rendered ever more potent by the accumulated legacy of their iteration, that Bernini's art found its forms. The force of his bodily and gestural language in turn hinged on his viewers' apprehension of his art through cultural memories of ritual, art and theatre. This process of empathetic identification is central to his work.

Turning again to the literary reception of Bernini's art in his time, in addition to biographies it is also characterised by a rich legacy of poetry composed about individual monuments.³⁸ Paradigmatically, this took the form of verse written as if in dialogue with the sculptures themselves, endowing them with the illusion not only of movement but also of voice; in Baldinucci's words, 'We imagine that the marble speaks.'³⁹ Much of this verse on Bernini's sculpture issued from Rome's literary *accademie*, those early modern cultural institutions dedicated to the arts and letters. The core activity of most academies was the recital of learned speech constructed as a social pastime. Academy members engaged in performances of verse or wit on a given topic or theme, which commonly included works of art. These cultural forms permeated other aspects of aristocratic social life, played out in palace salons and villa gardens. Similarly, a parallel practice of recitation took place in Bernini's studio as part of his training for apprentices. He trained these same as actors in his plays. Thus the speaking, performing body was native to his work space, and instrumental in his artistic process.

Baldinucci's *Vocabolario toscano dell'arte del disegno* offers a definition of *vivacità* – liveliness, lifelikeness – that acknowledges its basis in workshop talk, the pragmatics of imitation. Artists worked the material means of illusion to endow their figures with the semblance of life: the eyes were to have a fixed gaze, the mouth to be open, as if speaking.⁴⁰ The court poet Lelio Guidiccioni, describing Bernini's busts of Urban VIII and Scipione Borghese (see figs. •• and ••), captured this in a eulogy that touched on the open, sculpted mouth: '[Bernini,] you work miracles, you make marble speak.'⁴¹ Thus the sculpture became a 'speaking likeness', the viewer 'hearing' speech through the figuration of an open mouth.⁴² Yet Guidiccioni's criticism acknowledged the means of art's fiction as much as it was transported by it. On the one hand, he heard the marbled figures 'speak'. On the other, he described watching Bernini at work, discovering there the physical and material means of his artistic illusion: 'bending over, stretching up, modelling with his fingers . . . marking the marble with charcoal in a hundred places, striking the marble with a mallet in a hundred others, striking in one place while looking in another. . . . At times you hold in your fingertips the images . . . to be rendered in marble; at times you find the forms magically hidden within the marble.'⁴³

This bifurcation between viewing as a form of transport and as a study of the technical means of its illusion runs through seventeenth-century art criticism. If the critics 'entered into' art's fictions they also sought to grasp the manner of their making. The art itself embodies this: hence the stucco cherubs that run along the entrance arch to the Cornaro chapel festoon it with floral garlands, the decoration still in progress in a finish that uncovers its own process (see fig. 3).⁴⁴ This structure also characterises contemporary discussion of theatre's scenographies, particularly the marvellous wonder of its rapid scene changes. This culture understood both art and theatre in terms of their capacity to evoke stupefaction, marvel, awe, but always accompanied by a fascination with the *techne* of illusion. As with the story of Montoya's portrait,

the hallmark was an apparent full confusion of life with art, founded in a fiction of materials. In the words of his biographers, Bernini worked his materials up to and beyond the limits of each medium, seeking the technical means to translate the effects of one into another. Sculpture's longstanding rivalry with painting was for Bernini a fertile well-spring on which he drew across his career. He took on this challenge by sculpting effects of texture, colour and light held to be the province of painters: translucent leaves, the shimmering reflections of satin, the vapour of clouds, the movement of the wind (figs 5 and 6).⁴⁵ The means to these visual effects lay in the handling of the marble, the use of the tools to variegate the finish and thereby forge differing patterns of light and shade across the surface of the stone. The dexterous use of the chisel was Bernini's method of rendering this gamut of visual effects, each with a different affective valence.⁴⁶ He surely also drew on his work for court theatre and festival productions, where he worked across the media of painting, sculpture and architecture to produce staged ensembles seen under changing effects of light. We may recall particularly Bernini's famous 'sun machine' staged in Rome and so avidly sought after by the French court, in which the sun rose and set across a succession of scenes, followed by a moonrise.⁴⁷ His temporary scenographies for church ritual, too, wrought their effects through the coordination of lighting, deploying thousands of candles and lamps to forge illusions of the heavens. Similarly in his sculpture, variations in the light's fall, from gentle interfused transitions on a smoothed marble surface to the drama of pooled shadows over deep relief, worked in tandem with pose and gesture to forge a concert of visual effects that structured the affective force of his figures. The conceit of transport 'into' his illusions that runs through the sources was predicated on an empathic identification with the mimetic 'liveliness' of the gesturing sculpted body, and the marks of the artist's act of carving in its surface relief.

Scenographies

With the portrait of Montoya, Bernini's doubling of art's mimetic means extended to a full confusion of the live with the factured body. In Bernini's scenographies, by contrast, as in the ensembles of his chapel decoration, the fiction of mirroring lay above all in a confusion of spaces. If Baroque painters fabricated illusions of the heavens by rupturing architectural ceilings with painted figures falling, optically, into the viewer's space (see fig. ●●), Bernini used his chapel ensembles to forge parallel deceptions through the concerted effects of painting, sculpture and architecture together (see fig. 1). Thus the fictive space of art's illusion was superimposed onto the viewer's architectural space in the same manner as a temporary scenography. In both instances, these spaces were both 'fictive' and 'real' at the same time. Even where physical access was in fact barred, the viewer's prehension was of a space that might be entered bodily. Yet these ensembles were also the realm of illusion, as with a stage set. In this sense the viewer's 'entrance' into the artful fiction contained within it the illusion of becoming an actor, an active participant, as the seventeenth-century literary reception of Bernini's work abundantly testifies. The efficacy of such illusion depended, paradoxically, on the force of its apparent realism, as emblematised in the structures of Baroque *trompe-l'œil*. If painters forged the fiction of optical projections into the viewer's space, Bernini's sculptural chapel decoration moved illusionistically to make these realms

interpenetrate, just as his stage sets did. Equally, Bernini's attention to the surface of his marbles endowed them with a haptic verism, a seeming 'embodiment' that was, in fact, a marvellous deceit.

If it is the case that each culture produces its own distinctive social space, as Henri Lefebvre has argued, we may suggest that the quintessential spatial form of the Baroque was one of scenographic illusion.⁴⁸ Its fictive spaces of theatre, festival, ritual and art can be read as paradigms of a Baroque culture characterised by performance. The metaphor of theatre describes myriad aspects of early modern culture, from the amplified rituals of church and court, aristocratic conversational mores and social etiquette, to the burgeoning of performance genres of theatre, opera and ballet in this period. Across disciplinary boundaries theatre emerges as a prevailing interpretative key for the Baroque, for which it has a heightened if not exclusive resonance. Its visual cultures, epitomised in Bernini's work across the domains of sculpture, architecture, theatre and scenography, were bound to this dominant cultural form.

* * *

This book uses Bernini's occasional work in theatre, festival and ritual as a prism through which to view his sculpture as embodied, its spaces as materialised illusion. To interrogate questions of cultural transfer between art and theatre in Bernini's work I pursue two distinct yet related lines of enquiry. The first is to consider Bernini's position as a court artist, in both Rome and across Europe more generally. In Rome this position hinged on nested circles of papal patronage, both princely and pious. The second is to reopen for discussion Bernini's work in 'the theatre', understood as performances embedded within overarching rituals of court and church.⁴⁹ To proceed, this study contextualises Bernini's ephemeral work for theatre within the folds of an early modern court culture, centred around that of the papacy as both Catholic and secular sovereign. The opening two chapters form a diptych, acting in a counterpoint to each other. The first focuses on court entertainments, the second on ritual theatre within the church interior. The patronage of the papal court and its entourage was undoubtedly central to exchanges between Bernini's ephemeral work in theatre and his permanent works of art. In Rome the cultural manifestations of papal and curial patronage were inextricably intertwined with those of the Catholic faith, and I have not sought to separate them here. If one chapter emphasises the social demands of palace culture in studying inter-visual relations between Bernini's art and scenographic work, and the following one centres on the church interior, yet the analysis is structured by the interdependence of these realms. This is evident in that Rome's court theatre productions, including Bernini's, clustered around the annual pre-Lenten celebrations of Carnival. This is true both of the many religious dramas for court productions, for which Bernini produced scenic effects, and of the better-known comedies he wrote and directed himself. Equally, lighting and scenographic effects devised for church ritual occasions might be translated into the realm of court theatre entertainments, and vice versa. This ready exchange is most evident in renderings of skies/the heavens, a visual motif that dominated early modern theatre and ritual alike, running across these different spheres. A further thread that runs through the chapters is the reception of art's illusions by Baroque viewers. If a court culture configured

art's illusions in terms of the marvellous, within the church interior this same illusionism signified the presence of the miraculous divine.

Interwoven with an overarching thesis of art as a parallel form of illusion to theatre, this book examines Bernini's sculpture through a series of cultural spaces in which his work may be said to have 'performed'. These are the subject of successive chapters. The first is concerned with Bernini's ephemeral scenographies for aristocratic entertainments in palace interiors; the second with his temporary works for religious ritual in tandem with his permanent chapel decorations. Together these two opening chapters uncover the manufacture of these scenographies as a kind of 'laboratory' for the Baroque artist, a realm of artistic production closely tied to preparatory processes in the studio. Thereafter follow three chapters devoted to the study of individual monuments that span Bernini's artistic career. These are analysed within the variegated cultural spaces for which they were made. Chapter 3 studies Bernini's sculpture within the exclusive realm of cardinalate entertaining in the space of the villa; Chapter 4 is concerned with his monumental works for Rome's public squares. Respectively, these chapters treat two art works that dominate Bernini's artistic career. First, his *Apollo and Daphne* (see figs •• and ••) made for a princely art collection in an aristocratic villa and so tied to the myriad cultural enactments of courtly conversation and literary recital that formed a part of princely leisure. Second, the *Fountain of the Four Rivers* (see fig. ••) situated in the public urban square, as a monument that memorialised in permanent form the ephemeral arts of festival. Finally, Chapter 5 turns to the artist's studio as a social space, to examine Bernini's artistic practice as a form of cultural performance for court audiences. In so doing it draws together artistic production with reception, for the Baroque court artist worked before an audience who viewed his crafting of art's illusions as a form of aristocratic *divertissement*. The chapter focuses on the fabrication of Bernini's bust of *Louis XIV* (see fig. ••) as the material embodiment of a performed artistic practice bound within courtly mores and the reification of sovereignty.

The substance of each chapter in this book is predicated on a contextualised analysis of a monument from Bernini's corpus, read as a cultural 'event';⁵⁰ each uses abundant source materials in diaries, letters, *avvisi*, poetry, prints, biographies and other forms of art-critical commentary. Together they speak to a succession of distinct yet representative spheres for Bernini's work: the princely, the public; the church, the palace; the art collection, and the studio. In all of the spaces into which Bernini's art was received, this book argues that his audiences viewed art's illusions as a form of cultural play similar to those of theatre's scenographies. The final chapter finds this cultural expectation at work even within the realm of artistic production. The Baroque art object was above all the cultural agent of illusion, the locus of stupefaction, wonder and awe. Thus we may term Baroque art 'performative'.⁵¹ Bernini's methods of embodied lifelikeness unleashed the force of art's deceit, so as to draw its viewers into a succession of scenographic encounters, constructed as cultural 'imaginaries' – of faith and devotion in the church interior; courtly love and humanist arcadias in princely palaces and villas; princely fêtes and papal magnificence in Rome's streets and squares; and the demiurgic powers of the artist at work, forging Baroque art's marvellous illusions.

Palace Scenographies

In one of Bernini's many court conversations, conducted while he worked on a piece of sculpture during his sojourn in Paris, a guest – the Duke of Créqui – asked after his figure of *Truth Unveiled by Time* (fig. 7). As Bernini explained in reply, this piece was not complete nor was it a work executed for a patron. Instead it was a group that he had undertaken for himself, to be kept in his house in perpetuity, a stipulation borne out in his will. In fact, only the figure of Truth, a female nude, and the drapery by which she is unveiled were ever executed; the male figure of Time remained hypothetical, the untouched block of marble still in Bernini's house at his death. Myriad sources indicate a date starting in the second half of the 1640s for this sculpture, securely linking it to the most difficult episode of Bernini's career, the dismantling of his bell tower for St Peter's on the grounds that it was causing the dome of the church to crack.¹ His biographers affirm that the figure of Truth was the artist's response to his critics, an allegorical gesture that the bell tower suffered at the hands of a politics of envy following the death of Bernini's great patron, Urban VIII, rather than through any fault of its own. When Bernini described the piece to Créqui he added that as he rebuilt his reputation the figure of Truth became proverbial among circles of the *curia* in Rome: 'Truth', the expression ran, 'was only to be found in the house of Bernini,' surely a reference to the fact that the sculpture was not for sale, as well as to Bernini's restored virtue. As Chantelou describes it, Bernini also told Créqui that he had made reference to this piece, and to its meaning, in one of the comedies he put on in those years. One character within the play bemoaned his misfortune at the hand of unjust persecution, to which another replied that Time would at last unveil the truth. The witty reply ran: 'It is true that Time reveals Truth but he doesn't always reveal it in time.'²

This episode appears to mark the only direct instance of an iconographic link between Bernini's art and his theatre productions. The lack of such specific correlatives linking the two realms has discouraged research into interconnections between these spheres. Yet there are motifs that recur across the boundaries of theatre and art in Bernini's work, although not of a word/image kind. What translates between these two arenas of his activity is an intertwined vocabulary of visual effects, especially lighting, sharing common characteristics within an overarching language of illusion. In taking up Bernini's work in theatre as a prism through which to view his sculpture, this chapter plumbs the parameters of Bernini's scenographic effects in theatre and in art alike.

Court Entertainment

In 1655 Bernini played a central role in the papal court's ritual welcome for Queen Christina of Sweden, following her conversion to Catholicism, abdication and arrival

in Rome. He designed her triumphal arch at Porta del Popolo, her carriage, her ceremonial throne, and the table *trionfi* for banquets in her honour, as well as her apartments in the Vatican. He also hosted her tour of the Vatican, deploying his consummate conversational skills as well as his artistic ones in the service of the papal court.³

The events of Christina's welcome epitomise many of the larger issues brought to prominence by Jennifer Montagu's publications on the so-called minor, or decorative arts and their place in the oeuvre of the seventeenth-century Roman sculptor.⁴ To lose them from view is to lose the material traces of patronage in this period; to recount them brings to light the tissue of social relations within which art objects signified. We may extend the boundaries of the analysis to include not only surviving decorative arts, but also those occasional arts such as scenography, traces of a much vaster visual culture through which patronage, especially that of the court, was negotiated. Thus social and 'theatrical' performance remained densely interwoven. Theatrical interludes occurred within larger festive composites not yet fully severed from 'lived experience' – Warburg's meeting point for cultural genres. Scholarly literature on the court artist insists that the defining characteristic of this figure was the protean ability to work across media to serve the sovereign's needs in the production of princely display, including permanent works of art but also court entertainments.⁵ In all these capacities Bernini served the popes: as sculptor and architect, but also in orchestrating costumes and floats for Carnival masking; designing scenographies for noble banquets; and in the scenic effects of the *intermezzi*, or 'interludes' that attended aristocratic entertaining.

Court entertainments were, to borrow from the anthropologist's terms, 'total phenomena' that brought together music, ritual, rhetoric, and visual and performance arts, integrated within the social realm of feasting, masking and dancing. Their episodic structure could stretch over several days for a princely wedding, and over several weeks for Carnival. Remaining within the realm of the visual for the moment, they required the artist to build and decorate temporary festive structures, scenic interiors and backdrops, commingling the materials and techniques of painting, sculpture and architecture to produce a fused scenography for courtly play. Sources abundantly testify to this in the value they place on universality in any encomia of the artist at court. Bernini epitomised these abilities, his oeuvre encompassing projects as vast as the colonnade for St Peter's, as trifling as figured marzipan for a princely banquet: a sculptor and architect who also painted. His work at court extended to the related realm of 'theatre'.

Before moving on to consider how these were related, I want first to pursue further the notion of 'universality' in the figure of the court artist. Medial exchange was fundamental to the definition. Thus the workshop practice of translation between media finds its genesis in the early modern scenographies of court and church. Extrapolating from the rich secondary literature on Baroque festival decoration, to which Bernini made at least thirty contributions across his career, often including 'theatre', it is possible to suggest a convergence between his work with ephemeral arts and his preparatory processes for permanent works of art. In terms of media and so of techniques, the processes were common. This is also true of the ritual 'theatres' Bernini made for funerals, canonisations of saints and other religious services. Theatre sets, like festival floats and ritual decorations, frequently included sculptures and figu-

rines made from stucco, clay, wax, wood, *papier-mâché* and gesso. These same materials served as preparatory media in the development of a project for a permanent piece of sculpture or architecture.⁶ Specific examples of cross-fertilisation between these arenas are difficult to trace because the survival rate is so poor; nonetheless some preliminary conclusions about exchanges between them within the workshop may be drawn. Similar materials engendered a shared technical vocabulary across the two realms, which in turn facilitated the transfer of common visual effects from one sphere to the other. We know that much was reused from one event to another, both for theatre performances and festival or ritual decorations. Within a workshop context we may readily imagine that this also extended to preparatory studies for permanent works of art, establishing an easy practice-based point of transfer from one realm to the other. Moreover, festival, ritual and theatre figurines took their place within larger decorations composed of several media: ephemeral architectural structures, usually made of wood, *papier-mâché* and gesso; and painted canvases for backgrounds. These temporary architectural structures and the figurines that populated them were also painted, sometimes to resemble life but also to look like the materials of permanent art objects – faux marble, bronze and gold, for example.⁷ Thus the ephemeral acted as a locus of experiment for the artist, in some respects parallel to that of preparatory forms, and one rich in the fusion and interchange between media that Lavin identified in Bernini's 'unity of the arts'.⁸

Because court entertainments were ephemeral events for which little evidence remains, our knowledge of them derives largely from textual descriptions by contemporary observers in letters, diaries and account books, and from prints and drawings. While the live aspects of performance can never be fully recovered yet the historical sources, albeit fragments or secondary descriptions of these lost events, are rich. Following the biographies, and on the basis of recent research, scholars of Baroque theatre have estimated that Bernini put on at least twenty theatre productions in the course of his career from the 1620s into the 1670s.⁹ They took different forms according to varying patronage circumstances, with a concentration under the Barberini and later the Rospigliosi papacies. He composed, staged and acted in his own comedies during Carnival season, for which he trained his studio assistants as an acting troupe, playing in various locations, including the palaces of his patrons and the Vatican foundry near the Belvedere courtyard, as well as his own house in his later years.¹⁰ Recent research confirms that he also acted as scenographer for the Barberini papacy, a common task for a court artist, in productions at their palace, the centre of theatrical developments in Rome during the 1630s and early 1640s. Theatre historians have stressed both the centrality and the significance of Bernini's scenographies to the development of theatre arts in this fertile period of their history.¹¹ Again, contemporaries commented on Bernini's universality: in 1644 John Evelyn recorded that Bernini 'painted the scenes, cut the statues, invented the engines, composed the music, writ the comedy and built the theatre all himselfe'.¹²

Evelyn's reference to 'building the theatre' relates to the temporary wooden sets-cum-stages erected for particular productions. These were fabricated within the occasional rooms of palace interiors, where most court theatre took place.¹³ This type of theatre architecture was thus itinerant, moveable as occasion demanded. It was therefore possible to construct each 'theatre' according to the production it would host, to coordinate its architectural components both with the scenography of the play and

the permanent architecture of the room. In this way the 'theatre' acted as a door or frame between the social space of the audience, and the illusionistic space of the play. Thus theatre was the conduit by which the audience 'entered into' the illusions of art.

Stage Sets

The descriptions of theatrical performances connected with Bernini in the sources are composed of comedies for the Carnival season but also of what are surely *intermezzi*, those briefer yet most lavishly decorated forms of thematic entertainment, based on marvellous scenographic effects, that were inset within larger court productions. They generally accompanied a musical interlude, often turning on a fiction of place. Functioning as an element within a larger corpus of festive entertainments, like a 'play within a play', they consisted of prologue, *entr'actes* and epilogue to the acts of a theatrical narrative. Increasingly spectacular, the *intermezzi* were often linked by a theme that progressed from one interval to another, their splendour a social mirror of the patron's lustre. Often they became the 'reverse side' of the seamless narrative play, an alternative genre in which the artificer invited reflection on the nature of theatre as illusion, such that artfulness became their theme. Older historical traditions have tended to cast the history of theatre in this period in terms of the origins of modern forms, focusing on the first appearances of dedicated theatre buildings, proscenium arches and professional actors. But if we look through the lens of court culture, what dominates is a more fluid relationship between the realms of staged and social performance. These entertainments were performed on temporary stages erected in the large reception rooms of private palaces. During these events, the prince was both spectator and spectacle, the motor of the entertainment's unfolding and the social focus of the event. Household pages formed the theatrical corps and star performers were usually court retainers; at the same time, many performances were played by family members and their friends. This reciprocity between audience and illusion was made manifest also in the fusion of the theatre's proscenium with the architecture of both the room and the set. Typically the front of the stage was broken by stairs, which the players descended to close the entertainment with an informal ball in which 'actors' and 'audience' danced together. Members of a court audience at times sat within the space of the stage. Traditional masking during Carnival meant that the audience, as well as the performers, might come in costume. Further interweaving the fictive and the social realm, many performances were preceded or followed by banquets, at which prominent players dined with other guests, of whom Bernini was surely one. These means effected a 'oneness' of place between actor and audience. The early modern trope of the 'play within a play' was thus constituted within the social fabric of court entertainment, whose theatrical interludes were embedded, mirror-like, within the ongoing 'performance' of court life.¹⁴

From Bernini's work in theatre his biographers singled out for attention the fame of his scenic effects. Representative of broader scenographic developments of the period, these comprised seeming floods and fires, but also the wonder of Bernini's orchestration of light. It is clear from the remaining evidence that Bernini deployed these scenographic effects variously within a diversity of performance forms. As was common practice he repeated them by recombining them in different arrangements

from one performance context to another. This was surely the case with his ‘sun machine’, so beloved by the French court. Both Baldinucci and Domenico Bernini cite the artist’s invention of a stage machine for representing the rising of the sun, which became so famous in Barberini Rome and throughout Europe that Louis XIII, through his minister Richelieu, asked for a model of it.¹⁵ A letter from Francesco Barberini dating from 1635 indicates that Bernini was already using this in prologues to his Carnival comedies by the mid-1630s, ‘having rendered a beautiful view representing a stretch of sea with the sun rising little by little, casting its reflections in the water’.¹⁶ It was used in Palazzo Barberini in 1639 in a court production of Giulio Rospigliosi’s comic opera *Chi soffre, spera*, for which Bernini staged an interlude called *La fiera di Farfa* with scenic effects including that of a sun that passed from dawn to dusk over the duration of the entertainments.¹⁷ Girolamo Teti described seeing it ‘little by little rising over the waves’, which the entering viewer could mistake for the sun he had just left behind outdoors.¹⁸ A pen and ink drawing of a low sun setting in a clouded sky and casting reflections over water along a rocky shore, long attributed to Bernini’s circle, suggests itself as a representation of this scenographic effect (fig. 8).¹⁹ This effect was cited with wonder by the *avvisi* from Rome to all the courts of Europe, and by such means must have reached the ears of Louis XIII. Letters to Mazarin suggest that the French recruited Italian artists who had some working connection with Bernini to come to Paris, and prove that Bernini promised to instruct them in the ‘method for illuminating and making that sun’.²⁰ Bernini’s biographers instead insist that the artist sent a model to the king with a set of instructions in his own hand.²¹ Both may be true.

Whatever the means of transmission, staged effects of a moving sun appeared in Paris in the 1641 production of Jean Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin’s tragicomedy *Mirame* at Richelieu’s new theatre in the Palais-Cardinal. They were acclaimed as a delightful ‘tromperie’:²² Stefano della Bella’s prints of scenes from this production show a cloud-filled sky through which a low-setting sun’s rays send a cascade of reverberating lights (fig. 9).²³ This visual evidence, alongside that of the Berlin drawing, may be read in conjunction with manuals of scenographic technologies from the period to establish a sense of how Bernini might have staged this effect. Niccolò Sabbatini’s *Pratica di fabricar scene e machine ne’ teatri* of 1638, which Bernini owned, instructs the reader on the means of staging a dawn scene:

How to make the dawn rise

First make a piece of sky of a suitable width and depth. . . . Paint this section . . . with sky blue and white at the top, then with orange, then with red, and finally with a blue that intermingles with the atmosphere [*sfumato*]. This piece of sky should be placed in the machine which is to bring dawn forth. . . . As the dawn begins to rise the part coloured blue and white appears first, then the orange. As the dawn rises further the red appears and when the dawn has risen to its full height you see the blue *sfumato*. Once the dawn is fully risen this piece of sky should also be raised to become part of the main sky.²⁴

The German theatre engineer Joseph Furttenbach, who worked in Italy from 1610 to 1621, also described sunrise effects achieved through shining torches from behind coloured glass and painted paper or canvas, and instructed on the use of beaten gold reflectors cupped behind the lights to scatter the beams.²⁵

The Berlin drawing and the della Bella print (figs 8 and 9) indicate that the moving sun was set within a series of moving ‘cloud machines’ of the kind so prominent in descriptions of stage sets from the period. Again, Sabbatini gives detailed instructions, with diagrams, on how to make a cloud move across the stage, change colour and descend (fig. 10). Fabricated of painted canvas or *papier-mâché* on wooden frames suspended from above on pulleys or levers, these artificed clouds stemmed from longstanding traditions of festival decorations, processional floats, religious drama and firework displays. Indeed the construction of clouds dominates discussion of scenographic practice in Bernini’s one surviving play script, a comedy usually known as *The Impresario*. His characters argue about their fabrication: not the ‘cheap gauze’ clouds that some make, nor the kind that are hauled into place, ‘bang, with a counterweight’, but stretches of sky with clouds that expand, clouds detached from their backdrop that are three-dimensional, that float with the wind:²⁶

GRATIANO: I want it to appear completely natural. . . . By natural I don’t mean a cloud stuck in place up there. I want my cloud standing out, detached against the blue, and visible in all its dimensions like a real cloud up in the air.

SEPIO: Up in the air, eh? That’s nothing but doubletalk. Detach it from up there, you’ll more likely see a cloud on the floor than in the air – unless you suspend it by magic.

GRATIANO: Ingenuity and design constitute the Magic Art by whose means you deceive the eye and make your audience gaze in wonder, make a cloud stand out against the horizon, then float downstage, still free, with a natural motion. Gradually approaching the viewer, it will seem to dilate, to grow larger and larger. The wind will seem to waft it, waveringly, here and there, then up, higher and higher – not just haul it in place, bang, with a counterweight.

SEPIO: Eh, Messer Gratiano, you can do these things with words but not with hands.

GRATIANO: Now look here. Before we’re through, I’d like you to see what the hand can do. Follow me, I’ll explain how to go about it.²⁷

It is fair to say that Bernini’s most admired scenic effects of the 1630s – of sun and cloud, fire and water – draw on earlier traditions of ritual and theatre decoration. Across the early modern period Italian scenographic history was one of constantly reinventing well-established genres of atmospheric effects – waves and clouds, conflagrations, dusk, dawn and moonlight scenes – as prints and drawings of stage sets, and treatises on stagecraft abundantly make clear. In a visual culture structured as mimesis, such effects acted as canonical tropes for imitation, and distinction lay in the manner of their rendering. We may conjecture that Bernini’s versions of these feats of illusionistic scenography were received with wonder because they were so marvelously wrought in artistic terms.

The ‘Play within a Play’

Probing more deeply into the visual language of early modern scenography, we find that contemporary descriptions, including those of Bernini’s sets, dwelt heavily on the

sense of place instilled in the viewer by means of illusion. This fiction of transport to another place rested entirely on the skill of its seeming presence. The paradox at the heart of this culture's engagement with mimesis, in scenography as in art, was that the greatest 'realism' of effects depended on the most artfully wrought techniques of illusionism. In the words of Bernini's character Zanni in his comedy of *The Impresario*: 'dov'è naturalezza è artificio'.²⁸ Scenography could transform one end of a palace hall into a fictive realm which, given the more fluid boundaries between social and staged space in court entertainment of the period, the audience may be said to have 'entered into' upon entering the room. Its intention was to forge an affective transport of the audience into an enchanted, imaginary space by illusionistic means. At the same time these entertainments, and specifically Bernini's, made many references to the here and now of the audience's 'real' or social world. The feigned world of staged illusion acted as a looking-glass, the proscenium as a threshold over which the audience might 'enter'. Thus a succession of changing scenes or *intermezzi*, each one inducing renewed marvel in its viewers, might include atmospheric effects such as a thunderstorm or a darkening sky but close with a garden like that of the palace in which the fête took place, with carriages passing through it as the guests had done shortly before and would do again on leaving.²⁹

In a 1637 performance entitled *Of Two Theatres*, Bernini's set played directly on the illusion of the stage as a mirror reflecting its court audience, but also as an opening, a feigned extension of audience space. He fabricated the deceit of a second, fictive audience composed of actors as well as cut-out reliefs and painted figures to extend the realm of the viewer into that of art.³⁰ This 'confusion' of stage and audience space may be said to have strengthened the seeming veracity of the illusion, authenticating the fictive through reference to the physical surroundings. These authenticating scenes, often at the opening and close of a production, functioned as bridges between the social and the staged. Proscenium arches, tailor made for each production, similarly played on the architecture of their surroundings to fuse the realm of fiction with that of the audience; and stages were not bound by the proscenium but commonly projected forwards from it as well as back. By these means the realm of illusion seemed both to mirror and to fuse with the audience's world, bringing them into a playful confusion, as with Teti's audience for the sun machine who had just left the setting sun behind on entering the theatre. This is most fully referenced in the figure of the prince, whether as privileged viewer and/or performer, whose presence was the fulcrum both of the social world in which the play took place and of the fictions it represented. Court entertainment thus performed a series of 'double' or 'meta'-theatres. The audience watched itself watching the play; at the same time viewers mentally 'entered' the illusionistic space they regarded through the porous early modern proscenium and its mirror-like set. Conversely the actors ranged across the threshold of staged space into that of the audience, playing on a forestage broken by stairs that linked the two worlds.³¹

Bernini's conceit of the *Two Theatres* was a scenic effect he staged more than once, with variations, which cut deep into the vein of the stage as a mirror. In 1637 it served as both prologue and epilogue. The curtain opened to reveal two actors, or masks, and beyond them a fictive audience in the place of the background. One actor faced the staged audience; the other its social counterpart. The parts were played by Bernini and his brother Luigi. To proceed they agreed to put up a dividing curtain between

their two 'stages' so that each could play to their respective viewers. The comedy then ensued, throughout which could be heard faint bursts of laughter from the 'other side'. At its close the two masks returned, that of the social audience asking his counterpart if it would be possible to see the 'other' audience. The dividing curtain fell away to reveal a perspective scene of palaces and gardens under a night sky lit by the moon and infinite stars that were veiled and unveiled by lightly scudding clouds. The scene was peopled by members of the fictive audience mounting into carriages, just as the social audience would shortly do.³² Chantelou's record of Bernini's recollection of the performance, possibly conflated with later versions, relates that the two masks closed the play not through the fall of a curtain but by opening a window onto a view of Piazza San Pietro to show the 'honourable company' leaving, some on foot, some on horseback, some in coaches. As Domenico Bernini described it, doubtless in his father's words, 'in the fiction one saw figures so resembling those that were true as to delight all in showing them to themselves, like seeing themselves in a mirror, such was the counterfeit'.³³

Bernini played the *Two Theatres* again in a Carnival production of the following year. This time the fictive audience was not that of a mirroring reflection of the guests but a ladder extension of the social viewer into illusionistic space. Giovan Battista Doni, literary figure of the Barberini entourage, described 'the fiction of seated viewers watching a comedy, the first row of which was composed of real men with their backs to the audience, which therefore saw itself within the proscenium in an extension from life into depth, while in the distance there was a great crowd of painted figures, such that there appeared to be an opening into a great hall'.³⁴ The proscenium acted here as the glass of a window looking into a reflexive yet fictive realm.

Returning to the doubled sense of place in early modern plays with specific reference to Bernini, we know that he staged a good number of plays in his working space at the Vatican foundry; and that several of these plays were fictively set in an artist's studio, in which he played the role of the artist and his studio assistants those of his workshop hands.³⁵ In the script of *The Impresario*, Bernini's part was configured as the traditional *commedia dell'arte* mask of Graziano, a father trying to protect his daughter from the wiles of love, but also as an artist requested to put on a play with marvellous scenographic effects for the prince. The comedy has two faces – that of the love plot of the *commedia dell'arte*'s traditions; and that of the artist–scenographer who fears a failure of his stage machinery. As the production of the play within the play develops, a scene unfolds in which Graziano the artist converses with the mask of Graziano to comment that 'the world is nothing but a comedy'.³⁶ Here Bernini forged a further window between the social frame, and the staged fiction.

This is also true of the structure of the visual effects in Bernini's scenographies. In a rendition he orchestrated in 1638 of the flooding of the Tiber, certainly a scenic *intermezzo*, the sequence began with a perspectival backdrop of Rome with St Peter's, the Castel Sant'Angelo and other monuments, and running water in the back section of the stage to represent the Tiber, clearly referencing the world of the audience. Gradually the waters began to rise, a play on an actual flooding of the city by the river in the preceding year. Men on stage began to ferry others from one place to another as if the river had already flooded the lower parts of the city, as had happened during the actual flood; and actors playing the parts of officials began to check the fictive embankment. Suddenly the embankment broke and waters began to run furiously

across the stage towards the space of the audience. Those closest began to flee but just as the flood seemed to reach them a wall arose to hold the waters back within the realm of theatrical space.³⁷ The ingenuity of the piece turned around this moment of full fusion/confusion between the world of the viewer and that of Bernini's artistic illusion.

In the scenes of *The Impresario* that revolve around the fabrication of clouds, Bernini presents to his audience both a discussion with his workshop assistants on the technical means of rendering the immaterial lightness of floating clouds and a picture of their effect of transporting viewers into the realm of illusion. On viewing the clouds, Coviello exclaims: 'I'm no longer Coviello. I'm a body without a soul. I'm completely beside myself. . . . They will strip you of your soul, enchant you, turn you to stone. Visions of paradise, things to take your breath away.'³⁸ Thus the reflexive structure of the play encompassed within it the audience's marvelling absorption in its artficed illusions: Coviello is 'beside himself, enchanted, turned to stone'. At the same time the text of the play reveals the mode of production, and so the fact that the clouds are manually, materially made.

Literary reception of Bernini's art, and of art criticism of the period more generally, is commensurate. It is both willingly deceived by art's illusions, and intent on describing their means. Baldinucci's poetic response to Bernini's *Truth Unveiled by Time*, written in the fictive voice of the figure of Truth, is archetypal:

From my ancient rock
To give me life and voice
And not only voice and life but also motion, flight
An artist, unique in this world
One day drew me forth; his hand desiring
With its busy chisel
And its careful hammer
To strike upon me blows of life.³⁹

The marble 'speaks' only to acknowledge her stony materiality, figured by the sculptor's 'industry' – the chisel, the hammer, and above all the demiurgic hand of the artist that, as Graziano maintained to Sepio, alone could forge the semblance of nature, the fiction of 'life'.⁴⁰

Illusion's Craft

For the feast of the Assumption on 15 August 1668 Cardinal Flavio Chigi hosted a garden entertainment overseen by Bernini, described as a 'gastronomic comedic-musical feast'. The entertainment began with a singer costumed as a gardener to play the part of welcoming host, thus forging a reflexive 'play within a play' that linked the social space of the garden with its guests to that of its enacted fictions. Thereafter followed an invitation to dine, yet the table provided by the gardener was one of rustic fare; deities of the garden would correct this. While Pomona and Flora sang, Bacchus kicked the table into the fountain to effect a scene change. The gardener's table disappeared to be replaced by a 'theatre', a 'garden within the garden' framed by fictive walls, the leaves and branches of the trees silvered and lit by a hundred torches, regal

buffets of crystal, gold and silver, and tables decorated with sugar sculptures and iced and candied fruit. Other musical and comic relief entertainments and scene changes ensued: for the dessert course, a serving table with *trionfi*, flanked by eight smaller tables, disposed 'like theatre wings'. Following further performances of singing, the scene changed yet again: the party witnessed effects of seeming lightning and thunder, after which a rain of scented water and confectionaries fell to signal the close.⁴¹ In this entertainment aristocratic social life unfolded as a succession of wondrous scene changes.

The event underscores the key position of the scene change in seventeenth-century scenography. In fact, the scene change became the culmination and the litmus test of Baroque scenographic skill. The ability to effect a transformation 'all at once' rested on an emergent technology based on revolving triangular wings and flats that allowed all the elements of a stage set to change simultaneously, driven by one wheel (fig. 11). Contemporary descriptions of performances return repeatedly to this, viewing the scene change as the culmination of art's deceit in 'suddenly bringing everything together'. These transformations were not wrought behind curtains but in full view of the audience. So swift and complete, they seemed to reveal their mechanics but in fact occluded them, for the rapidity with which they were executed defied the viewers' full comprehension. Viewers understood this process that exceeded their understanding through a poetic language of marvel – 'the scene changed insensibly, it stupefied, it amazed'. In Furttenbach's words, 'the scene changes so swiftly that none of the spectators no matter how keenly he looks at the stage can see how it is done', 'a suddenness that astounds and delights the spectators', 'who can scarce divine how the change is brought about'. A new scene renders 'the spectator . . . so overcome with wonders that he scarcely knows whether he is in the world or out of it'.⁴² The source of the viewers' delight was to witness a marvellous illusion. The scene change staged this dominant Baroque conceit, endowing it with a seeming presence.

Like the table pushed into the fountain at the Chigi banquet, many of Bernini's most celebrated scenographic effects worked to usher in a fully illusionistic transformation of the scene. In the series of scene changes that Bernini staged as part of a composite entertainment for the Carnival of 1638 the evening began with the feigned flooding of the Tiber, which surely acted to 'sweep away' the first scene and make way for its successor. Similarly, the comedy around which the entertainment was constructed contained a scene of a house falling down. The Duke of Modena's agent described this as a 'cosa maravigliosa' for onto the stage were emptied 'stones, beams, and plaster with a great noise and clouds of dust'.⁴³ The house was transformed into a ruin, paving the way for a complete scene change such as Sabbatini described. The commentary is signal in viewing Bernini's theatre as a form of marvellous deceit, that early modern paradigm of reception.

Bernini also seems several times to have staged effects of the theatre catching fire. In 1635 a house on the stage seemingly caught fire, 'feigned so realistically and so suddenly that it filled the spectators with terror'.⁴⁴ Both Domenico Bernini and Chantelou reported what were surely Bernini's descriptions of his fire scenes, with variations that suggest he played this more than once. Domenico describes a carnival float with accompanying torches, one of whose bearers kept rubbing his torch against the set, which must have been of painted architecture on a canvas soaked in spirits beforehand, as if to increase the flame by rubbing it against a wall 'as was often done'.

Members of the audience as well as players on the stage began to shout at him to stop because of the danger of setting the canvas alight. The audience became terrified, all the more so as flames began to spread, threatening to set the whole theatre on fire. At the height of the confusion the fire scene changed 'with a marvellous order' and out of the fire appeared a delightful garden. Among the audience the wonder at this change was as great as their earlier terror of the fire; they all absolved their unfounded fear by praising the skill of the deceit.⁴⁵ Chantelou describes a similar production for the Barberini with a fire scene: again a torchbearer knocked his torch against the back cloth as if to increase its flare. His instructions were to continue to do this until someone in the audience called out that it might set the place on fire, which was Bernini's signal to light up the stage. The fire quickly covered the whole area including a large cloud suspended from above. As people began to hasten from the theatre Bernini diffused this by appearing on the stage himself to ask them to stay. A player in peasant garb then appeared leading a plodding donkey slowly across the stage, his obstinate progress a counterpoint to the furious catharsis of the preceding scene.⁴⁶

The motif of the donkey appeared in another of Bernini's productions, in 1638, as part of an *intermezzo* of a Roman street with carriages, horses, people on foot and views of Rome in the background, all under a moonlit sky with gently moving stars. Clearly designed to accompany a musical interlude, its 'narrative' turned around the fiction of people on the street stopping to listen to this music from a 'hidden' source. At the close of the musical passage a donkey appeared on stage and began to bray. In both instances the donkey surely functioned as a form of comic relief to 'break' with what had come before: the plodding donkey contrasted with the high agitation of people seeking to flee a fire; and his dissonant braying with the pleasant order of musical harmony. It is also, I think, a satirical comment on another type of early modern court theatre, that of the great machine plays from north Italy, which required large stage spaces filled with wooden devices driven by scores of men, and horses to move the scenic machinery. This was Bernini's criticism on viewing the great 'Salle des Machines' built at the Tuileries palace by the Modenese theatre architect Gaspare Vigarani: 'in Modena they constructed machines that needed fifteen or twenty horses to draw them' and from their raised dais the king and his immediate court could see the apparatus, 'a great mistake'.⁴⁷ Seeing the horses move the machines undercut the scenographer's illusion and so its *meraviglia*. In Baldinucci's words, Bernini 'criticised the use of horses' saying that 'Art lies in that which is all fiction, yet appears real.'⁴⁸ Bernini's donkey playfully made the same point.

Drawing together evidence of Bernini's theatrical conceits and scenographic effects from his work in the theatre, we can read this material as a form of art 'theory', Bernini's conceptual commentary on the means of art's illusions. Similar to the workshop maxims Bernini passed on to his students in the studio, which his biographers record, his commentary on the practice of staging illusion in the theatre constitutes his reflections on the nature of artifice. Bernini's theatre work comprises a kind of practice theory, as does his art-making more broadly, centred around an understanding of art as a knowing deceit. While he criticised the raw revelation of illusion's means in the French view of their theatre horses, yet he choreographed himself and his plodding, braying donkey into his productions. The donkey's appearance, like his own, acted as a further level of meta-theatre, this time structured as a commentary on his practice as an artificer. At the same time this play within a play was concerned with

the processes of its own production, as in *The Impresario*. Its reference to the social realm was to that ‘behind the scenes’. Bernini’s 1637 production of *Two Theatres* similarly opened with the two characters, played by himself and his brother, each facing his respective audience with pencil and paper in hand in the act of drawing. At the beginning of the epilogue scene, one mask arrived as if from the theatre on the other side, wiping his brow to feign a heat from the force of his own performance.⁴⁹ The coupling of these scenes suggests a proximity between ‘sketching’ and performing, the processes of art and those of theatre.

At least two of Bernini’s comedies were set in an artist’s studio, giving full reign to a commentary on artistic process as the fabrication of illusion. A play from 1635, known as *The Two Academies*, turned on a rivalry between a painting studio, or academy, and one for sculpture. The unfolding comic love plot took place amid art-making and discussions about the respective merits of sculpture and painting. The stage set was built as a material embodiment of early modern meta-theatre that made full use of the Italian perspectival tradition: the centre of the stage was a street and ‘buildings’ on each side, with doors and windows, stood for the two studios. By these means characters could enter and exit the different spatial realms. The arrangement thus facilitated a doubled play of eavesdropping on conversations from the street, all within equal earshot of the social audience (fig. 12).⁵⁰ While nothing further is known of its production details, the piece may also have played in the foundry studio and almost certainly deployed Bernini’s workshop assistants as his acting troupe. This would surely have doubled the force of the illusion and the wit of the artistic commentary, as with *The Impresario*. In this instance the intertwined plot ushered in a host of stage carpenters and scene painters, doubtless played by the same actors. The dialogue turned around sketches of plans and elevations, lumber and tools, mixing pigments and spreading plaster, making backdrops and perspectives, sky panels and cloud machines, and scene changes, all in order to forge theatre’s illusions – *apparenze*, as Coviello put it. Another comedy that Bernini described to Chantelou was similarly staged in the ‘studio’ and also turned around the figure of Graziano as artist. A young man seeking entry to the studio in order to pursue the artist’s daughter this time feigned both to be deaf-mute and to wish to learn to draw. Without dialogue between the main characters, their exchanges were enacted through mime – the language of gesture closest to that of the artist – again elaborating a further level of ‘play’ within the play.⁵¹

Other scenes brought into play the nature of artistic illusion in a culture of mimesis that converged on the representation of the human form. Pygmalion-like, Bernini forged figures of *papier-mâché* that ‘came to life’ and ‘walked’ on stage, or that faithfully reproduced the features of known personages within Rome. As with his flood scene, this threaded together stage illusions with collective social memories, what the Duke of Modena’s agent called “artifitiosissima”, which delighted and terrified all at the same time.⁵² Terror lay in the audience’s engagement with the artist’s illusion as it entered into its realm of dangerous presence; delight in the marvelling appreciation of its fabricated means. Yet another of his comedies described by Chantelou turned on a similar play of art as illusion. A young man, Cinzio, refused by his lover, fell into a faint which his valet mistook for death. The ensuing farce revolved around the valet’s seeing his erstwhile master and taking him for a ghost.⁵³ This confusion of theatre and life, the inanimate made animate, and the artist’s power to bring the dead to life lay also at the heart of Bernini’s epilogue to his 1637 production of the *Two Theatres*. It

closed with a view of the fictive audience leaving by carriage or horseback, succeeded by the appearance of a Grim Reaper on a skeletal horse. The narrator intoned that the figure of Death would thus cut the thread of all comedies, as he does life, so casting life and theatre as parallel illusions.⁵⁴ This interweaving of comedy and piety reflects the ritual context of Carnival within which much of Bernini's theatre sat.

* * *

In their broader consideration of Bernini's work in theatre, the sources emphasise two further strengths, in addition to the marvels of his scenographic effects: the wit of his satire in his comedies; and the vivid liveliness of the acting. In fact, both were also further means of 'calling' the viewer into the enacted fiction. The daring of Bernini's comedic satire rested on its references to current events and characters at court, fusing the world of the play with that of its coterie audience. Fulvio Testi, agent for the Duke of Modena in Rome, wrote this to his noble employer: 'On Monday the Cavalier Bernini . . . put on a comedy he had composed with comments to make anyone with a knowledge of court die of laughter because everyone, however small or great, whether prelate or cavalier, has a part.'⁵⁵ These comments were in the nature of *double entendres* that functioned within both the world of the play and that of the audience, asides that remarked on the characters and the unfolding plot within the play with reference to the social milieu of the viewers. In Doni's words: 'The Cavalier Bernini . . . who is excellent in many arts, is second to none in the production of comedies full of piquant wit. He himself plays many parts with great skill.'⁵⁶

With regard to his acting, the sources praised its seeming 'naturalism' and by extension that of his troupe of studio hands, whom he trained himself. This corporeal mimesis was itself a mirror of the audience, the actor's gestural language distilled from the observation of life, in its turn constructed by collective cultural memories of affect made manifest in bodily form. Svetlana Alpers has suggested that the practice of acting was an integral part of artistic training in Rembrandt's circle; and Montanari has documented a similar convergence in Bernini's workshop.⁵⁷ The evidence from Chantelou's diary also suggests that acting played a seminal role in Bernini's artistic practice, particularly in his use of 'action sketches' from a moving model.⁵⁸ In both sketching and posing, the purpose was, as Domenico Bernini put it, to forge the semblance of naturalism from illusion – 'far parer vero ciò che in sostanza era finto'.⁵⁹ Bernini used mime in at least one of his comedies – that of the deaf-mute studio apprentice and would-be lover – and some of the *intermezzi* entertainments, such as that of bystanders stopping to listen to music, suggest that the effect relied wholly on bodily expression without words. In the case of the comedic 'dumb show', the acting would doubtless have been exaggerated, its hyperbole a commentary on the naturalism of the players within the play proper. Equally, the movements of the actors attending to the strains of music might have been balletic in quality, again a telling juxtaposition with the greater 'lifelikeness' of the gestures within the narrative play. Both suggest a reflection on the nature of acting as artifice whose end was an apparent naturalism, as in Bernini's art.

The role of 'acting' within the studio as an aspect of artistic training was also practised by the Carracci, who with their pupils seem to have enacted bodily the poses they sought to figure in their art. This suggests a much broader understanding of

interrelationships between acting, posing and art-making.⁶⁰ Their biographers famously relate the story of Annibale Carracci approaching his pupil Domenichino unannounced as he worked on his representation of the *Flagellation of St Andrew* for San Gregorio Magno (fig. 13); he found Domenichino shouting and gesticulating wildly, and slowly realised that the young artist was ‘playing’ the part of the executioner he sought to portray.⁶¹ Scholars often point to the prominence of ‘recitation’ within Jesuit colleges, in which novitiates practised speaking using the affective means of classical rhetoric – gesture, expression, voice – to master the arts of persuasion.⁶² In fact, grammar school education of the period commonly incorporated elementary training in rhetoric, including the language of gesture, which seems also to have featured in the curriculum of Italy’s nascent art academies.⁶³ Broader types of Italian *accademie* practised a range of cultural activities, including improvised recitals;⁶⁴ the term ‘academy’ could also mean groups of artists meeting to draw after a posed model, suggesting a common equivalence between improvising and sketching. While Bernini’s deeper engagement with theatre surely heightened his understanding of the mimetic relationship between the actor’s pose and the artist’s model, the workshop practice of embodying the actions of a character as a means of finding its most resonant gesture was not uncommon in the early modern studio. This subject is further addressed in later chapters of this book.

Medial Translations

If sketching and improvising, the model’s pose and the actor’s gesture, were readily interchangeable aspects of process in the early modern studio, this intimates a further range of parallels and connections between Bernini’s work as a performer, director and scenographer and his art. My concern here is to consider how the practice of staging a performance might have shaped the ‘staging’ of his art; how his bodily experience as an actor fed into his artistic practice; how his knowledge of the possibilities of scenography’s visual effects might have constructed his study of sculptural illusionism; and, concomitantly, to what extent the art-viewing habits of his audiences were informed by their visual knowledge of theatre.

As well as cloudy skies and a rising and setting sun, Bernini and contemporary scenographers transformed day into moonlit night scenes, or into thunderstorms with seeming lightning and rain. Bernini’s interest in atmospheric lighting effects in the theatre calls to mind the context of the *paragone*, that early modern rivalry of the arts, and especially sculpture with painting. This was seminal for Bernini in his ambition to see sculpture surpass Renaissance painting’s acknowledged supremacy for its ability to render effects of the intangible, as Rudolf Preimesberger has taught us.⁶⁵ Bernini’s advice to his sculpture students, as reported by his biographers and Chantelou, turned on the means to render the optical illusion of colour in carving a colourless medium, and how to forge the illusion of softness, pliability, or evanescence in hard stone. By varying the surface tooling of the marble, with an eye to the differing refractions of light that different textures produced, Bernini famously ‘painted’ on the marble to achieve ductile flesh, translucent leaves, or billowing, porous clouds and radiant sunbursts effected through ‘hidden’ sources of light like those of theatre. This reading of the role of the *paragone* in Bernini’s work brings us back to the theme of the fusion of

the arts, in which the material limitations of each one are overcome to reach a synthesis through a common language of illusion. We may suggest that scenography played a pivotal role in Bernini's experiments with medial fusion as an arena in which the artist harnessed all the arts in the pursuit of a staged 'deception'. Thus the clouds of Bernini's *Cathedra Petri* in the apse of St Peter's (see fig. 11) are of gilt-painted stucco, as the rays of light that extend from the hidden window above the altar of the Cornaro chapel are of wood painted gold. Bernini deployed materials and means from the ephemeral realms of theatre, festival and ritual decoration in his permanent religious art, as the next chapter will discuss. Moreover, the gilt rays of the *Cathedra Petri* extend forwards from the window to run in front of the flanking pilasters, so projecting the illusion of dissolving the wall to fuse together the space of the church with art's illusion of the heavens beyond. Likewise the extending gestures of Bernini's sculptural figures – his *Habakkuk with the Angel* (fig. 14) and *Daniel*, for example – commonly reach beyond the boundaries of the niche into the viewer's space. It might be said that this pre-eminent form of Baroque illusionism, in which the spaces of art and of audience are interwoven, was structured in parallel to this culture's visual knowledge of its theatre – the porous proscenium, the mirroring set and the abiding conceit of the 'play within a play'.

Contemporary descriptions of viewing Bernini's art and viewing his theatre bear marked structural similarities in their language of transport 'into' the illusion. Seventeenth-century theatre technology made possible an ever greater range of dynamic effects through new techniques for moving parts, including figurines with the capacity for actions.⁶⁶ This is at least suggestive in its implications for this culture's propensity to view its artistic effigies as endowed with the capacity to move and speak that runs through the poetic reception of Bernini's work. It also suggests a parallel between Bernini's experience of finding the most potent gestural language in his acting and in his sculpture. Equally, the many 'bridging' strategies at work, knitting together the realm of staged fiction with the social space of the audience, epitomised in the permeability of the early modern stage, calls again to mind the emphatic, embodied gestures of Bernini's figures that project into the viewer's space. We may extend the simile to the critical history of Baroque art's 'open forms' and *trompe-l'œil* illusionism to suggest that the experience of theatre was formative to the artist's 'period eye'.⁶⁷ What seems to move between art and theatre in Bernini's oeuvre is not iconographic motifs, but a language of visual effects and their affective address. The common characteristics lie within an overarching quest for the means to draw the viewer 'into' the illusion. His sculpture, like his theatre, dwelt on the audience's embodied empathy with live acting in its pursuit of the most resonant poses and gestures, and the haptic effects of a surface illusionism to convey the qualities of seeming 'lifelikeness'. By these means the artist could engender a viewer response parallel to that of a theatre audience. The proof of his consummate skill lay in the realms of academic verse celebrating his sculptures that 'moved and spoke'.

* * *

Giovan Battista Doni described one of Bernini's comedies as the story of a giant who could not get through the door of a house he wished to visit. Within the play, the servants argued that the solution was either to destroy the house, or to cut the giant

in two. The sculptor's servant refused absolutely to permit the destruction of his master's house, comically insisting that no one would accept such a solution. So Covello led the giant off stage in order to cut him in two. He returned with the severed human parts that nonetheless still moved and walked.⁶⁸ By this means Bernini played on the illusionistic animation of the inanimate, of art's effigies taking on the semblance of life. As the truncated colossus walked before the play's audience, the artifice of its movement might be said to embody the Baroque artist's quest.

Theatres of Piety

In the spring of 1580, on a visit to the city of Parma, Annibale Carracci experienced a seminal encounter with Correggio's frescoes for the domes of Parma's great churches (fig. 15). He wrote with wonder to his cousin Ludovico of what he had seen: 'I could not resist immediately going to see the great cupola that you have so often praised to me and I am still stupefied by the sight of such a great machine, so well understood in all its parts.'¹ His designation of Correggio's banked clouds, arranged as an illusionistic opening into the heavens, as a 'gran macchina' may, I think, be read as a reference to the great 'cloud machines' that dominated not only early modern stage sets but also the lexicon of artficed clouds in ephemeral church decorations for the high festivals of the ritual calendar.² Annibale's parallel between the painted and the staged illusion is suggestive in its implications for a Baroque period eye. His assessment of Correggio's fresco in terms of a visual knowledge of the ephemeral arts of theatre and ritual bespeaks a historic intertwining of these realms. We see Annibale attend to the experience of the art image through the entangled prism of a much vaster, albeit occasional, visual culture. This chapter seeks to restore to view this firmament of lost scenographies in order to uncover how the period's permanent works of art were embedded within broader visual cultures. Addressing Bernini's work for the church interior, it constructs a dialogue between sacred scenographies, ritual enactments and devotional art. It thus traces a shifting landscape of pious practices through which these forms met and interfused. The analysis proceeds through a study of Bernini's sculpted altarpieces alongside devotional rituals and their attendant ephemeral decorations, enacted in religious interiors. The argument rests on an understanding of ritual as a process, unfolding within what Arnold van Gennep termed 'total' cultural phenomena.

Devotions of Glory

Seventeenth-century church ritual comprised a synaesthesia of the visual, aural and olfactory, and the bodily movements of the faithful. These ritual gestures and practices took place within temporary *teatri*, or 'sets' – composites of architecture, painting and sculpture, fabricated from wood, canvas and stucco for the occasion. In particular, I bring together here the new *Quarant'ore* devotions of Catholic Reform, which produced that scenographic leitmotif of Baroque art, the 'glory' or sunburst, with Bernini's permanent renditions of this form at St Peter's and in the Cornaro chapel of Santa Maria della Vittoria. Equally, the liturgies of canonisation and saints' day masses produced richly decorated ephemeral *teatri*, whose forms may be linked to the Cornaro chapel. Both liturgies were manifestations of a renewed Catholic piety in the face of Protestantism: the *Quarant'ore* elaborated on the efficacy of the Eucharist through the miracle of transubstantiation; canonisations and feast days strengthened the cult of

saints.³ Bernini, in fact, orchestrated examples of both: for example, the *Quarant'ore teatro* at the Cappella Paolina in 1628; and indirectly that at the Gesù of 1640; and the *teatro* for Andrea Corsini's canonisation at St Peter's in 1629.⁴ More broadly, Rome's successive manifestations of these devotions formed part of his visual knowledge. I place these devotional services, as well as the liturgy of the common mass itself, alongside two sculptural altarpieces by Bernini: *The Ecstasy of St Teresa* in the Cornaro chapel; and the *Cathedra Petri* in the apse of St Peter's. As the extensive scholarly literature on these monuments amply recognises, both works form part of larger decorative ensembles within their respective interiors of chapel and church, undertaken by large teams of artists and craftsmen working under Bernini's direction.⁵ At the same time, both were figured within developing conventions of altar decoration, tied to liturgical practices themselves formulated within the weave of church tradition and historical change.⁶ This requires attention not only to the enacted liturgy of the mass, with its cadence of hymns and chants and the signifying gestures of its officiating priest, but also to the decorative arts of altar adornment – candles, candelabra, incense holders, and the finely worked reliquaries and tabernacles that housed saints' remains and the bread and wine of the host.⁷ Finally, this interwoven history of altar and liturgy includes painted altarpieces and the painted vaults that surmounted them.⁸ Within this triangulation of paintings, objects and ephemeral decorations for ritual enactments converging on the church altar, Bernini's sculpted altarpieces took form.

* * *

The *Quarant'ore* devotions inaugurated by a culture of Catholic Reform took their name from the forty hours Christ was believed to have lain in the sepulchre before his Resurrection. The ritual was a forty-hour cycle of perpetual prayer before an altar decorated with a sunburst display, surrounding the Eucharist. This cycle of prayer extended across the city's various churches in a chain, so that the faithful could progress from church to church, each rite centred on a similar yet different ephemeral *teatro* for the display of the host. The ceremony made manifest the Council of Trent's prescription concerning the real presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist. It both heightened and exemplified Trent's requirement that the host be permanently displayed on altars for the adoration of the faithful, which also brought an efflorescence of richly decorated tabernacles. The ritual roots of the *Quarant'ore* surely lay in medieval Easter processions of the host from one altar to another within a church, staged as re-enactments of Christ's Entombment through the decoration of the tabernacle as a sepulchre. The ritual of the *Quarant'ore* centred on the saving power of the Eucharist, encompassing the pious significance both of Christ's Resurrection and the prophecy of his Second Coming. Over the first half of the seventeenth century it was to become one of the most important services of early modern Catholicism, attended by popes, cardinals and their retinues; *avvisi* from Rome relate the great anticipation with which new displays were heralded. The service itself was increasingly elaborated with hymns, chants, music and sermons. It often incorporated ritual re-enactments of Christ's Entombment and Resurrection through the symbolic 'burial' and resurrection of the host. These ritual actions were accompanied by sung dialogues relating the significance of Christ's Death and Resurrection, which developed into oratorios composed of song and *tableaux vivants* to narrate the key events of the biblical story.

Central to all *Quarant'ore* decorations were increasingly elaborated effects of light. Indeed, the motif that came to define the *Quarant'ore* display was that of the Baroque glory, a sunburst seemingly emanating from the host by means of large numbers of hidden candles. This was Bernini's design. While no visual record remains, textual sources establish its use for a *teatro* by Bernini for the Cappella Paolina in 1628. Our closest visual source is a print after a *Quarant'ore teatro* of 1640 by Bernini's follower Niccolò Menghini (fig. 16), the artist cited as the agent of transmission for Bernini's great sun machine from Rome to Paris in this same year (see Chapter 1).⁹ Prior to Bernini's 1628 display, *Quarant'ore* decorations had consisted of ephemeral architecture ornamented with silver vases, candelabra and candles to give a heightened lustre to the altar surround. Bernini instead used a system of some two thousand hidden lamps to form a glory of light. Cupped reflectors of beaten metal cast the beams onto banks of clouds, made of painted canvas or plaster, surrounding the Eucharist.¹⁰ In this Bernini borrowed from the longstanding scenographic conventions of sacred drama, the *sacre rappresentazioni*. Dating from the Middle Ages, and still performed across the early modern period, these religious plays had frequent recourse to staged cloud machines to effect divine transport between heavenly and earthly realms. Coterminously, aureoles of heavenly clouds, coupled with individual nimbus forms, as the means of divine transport to and from the skies constituted the dominant type for the upper register of the early modern church altarpiece. Bernini drew on this legacy, transposing such scenographic structures of banked clouds between the convergent realms of sacred drama and sacred painting. The intertwining of the realms of painting and theatre during the Renaissance in the motif of the cloud has often been pointed out.¹¹ Having translated this sunburst scenography into the realm of the *Quarant'ore* ritual, Bernini later applied it to permanent works of sculpture. The same motif became the backdrop to Teresa's vision in the Cornaro chapel, and the central feature of the *Cathedra Petri* (see figs •• and ••).

The glory motif usually formed part of larger ritual 'theatres' or scenographies. Pietro da Cortona famously followed and strengthened Bernini's example in a *Quarant'ore* display of 1633. In the main altar of San Lorenzo in Damaso, Cortona defined the apse as a proscenium framing the host. He surrounded the monstrance with an aureole of white clouds burnished with silver and gold to forge a dazzling glory of light (fig. 17). Importantly, Cortona superimposed his fictive *teatro* onto the actual space of this small church. Thus the plaster-on-canvas clouds surrounding the host extended beyond the space of the apse, 'floating' into the main physical space of the church in a full confusion of social and fictive space.¹² These displays turned on a contrast between the darkened church interior and intense concentrations of illumination from thousands of candles and oil lamps. By these means, artist-scenographers gave the effect of the heavens conjoined to the space of the church. In Cortona's example, this fusion of church and illusion was complete. By scenographic means, the heavens 'entered into' the church interior.

Joseph Furttenbach, the German scenographer who worked at the Medici court in Florence between 1610 and 1621 and later wrote treatises on theatre sets and lighting, designed a *Quarant'ore teatro* in the Pitti Palace in 1621, which further exemplifies this fusion of painted, architectural and sculptural decoration in the forging of fictive space. The sources describe a darkened room with a temporary proscenium arch covered in clouds on which music-making angels sat. Below, the architectural set framed painted

flats that led the eye into illusionistic views of Jerusalem and Christ's sepulchre, surmounted by a vision of the heavens.¹³ *Quarant'ore* displays commonly played thus at the boundary of the frame. They projected illusions of fictive space receding into depths far beyond the actual space of the building, such as Furttenbach's view of Jerusalem. They simultaneously cast forward fabricated clouds of plaster-covered canvas beyond the frame into the architectural space of the physical interior, in a full fusion of architecture and *teatro*. If the distant view of Jerusalem on a painted backdrop acted in the manner of painting, in its illusion of fictive space beyond the picture plane, the clouds that 'drifted' out of pictorial space and into that of the viewer forged bridges to connect the realms of painting and architecture. In his late seventeenth-century treatise on perspective, *Prospettiva de' pittori e architetti*, the painter Andrea Pozzo spoke to an understanding of this doubled spatial illusion, the purpose of which was 'to link together the fictive with the real . . . to the great delight and marvel of the viewer'.¹⁴ His illustrations combined theatre stage sets, *Quarant'ore* displays, altars and tabernacles, and the painted architecture of his great ceiling for the church of Sant'Ignazio in Rome, making plain this triangular exchange between scenographies, architectural design and painting (fig. 18). All were similarly engaged in an illusionistic conjoining of the heavens with the viewer's experience of architectural space. If this confusion of fictive and social space occasioned marvel at court, within the realm of the sacred it figured differently. In the church interior it signified the miraculous, the seeming presence of the divine on earth. In the words of Paolo Segneri, Italy's greatest Jesuit preacher, who had ties to Bernini through Padre Oliva and Sforza Pallavicino: 'in a perspective of splendours, in a theatre of majesty, in a nucleus of glory, you will see God'.¹⁵

Theophanies

The celebration of the Eucharist at the heart of early modern Catholic liturgy was framed by a ritualised succession of hymns, chants, prayers, readings and processions, along with the signifying actions of crossings, obeisances and censings, woven together into a sequence that formed the mass. Its constituent parts of prayer, chant and gospel traced their origins to the early Christian church. It is for reasons of this largely unbroken tradition that much of the mass was performed in the form of chant, comprising a direct link to early Christian practice. At the same time the history of the mass was one of constant re-elaboration, its changing form over time reflecting and representing broader histories of piety and religious devotion. At its core lay a synaesthetic and synchronic fusion of the Last Supper, Christ's Resurrection and his Second Coming, in the form of the Eucharist. The rich legacy of its symbols rested on a tradition of insistent allegory. Thus the celebration of the host was seen both to commemorate the history of Christ's sacrifice and miraculously to make real his presence, to manifest his coming again in glory. Running like a continuous thread throughout the mass was a poetic imagery of God as light to signify his redemptive power.¹⁶ The *Quarant'ore*'s celebration of the Eucharist gave visual form to this conception of the host as a manifestation of the Second Coming in terms of glory. In the words of the Nicene Creed: 'God of God, light of light . . . He comes again in glory.' The first verse of the Gospel of John, recited after the blessing of the host by the officiating

priest, elaborated this within the liturgy in a contrast of light with dark: 'And the light shineth in darkness' (John 1:5). Luke's foretelling of the Second Coming, like the vision of St John the Divine in Revelation, depicts this theophany in terms of a glory of light and cloud: 'And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory' (Luke 21: 27); 'Behold, he cometh with clouds' (Revelation 1: 7).¹⁷

* * *

Bernini's *Cathedra Petri*, the reliquary altarpiece in the apse of St Peter's, had a long gestation. Designed to house a wooden medieval throne on which the saint was believed to have sat as bishop of Rome, it held one of the basilica's most prized relics, second only to the body of Peter himself. Already in 1630, Urban VIII had approached Bernini to create a decorative altar display within which to mount it. Bernini's first design for the display of the throne, realised over the course of several years and in a different location within St Peter's, remained in place for a quarter of a century. It was then reconfigured under Alexander VII, again by Bernini, this time in the apse. In its earlier manifestation the throne was encased in ornamented gilt bronze set within a shallow recess (fig. 19). This recess was inlaid with alabaster and coloured marbles, marked by cloud-like striations surrounding a sunburst of gilt-painted wood. From its centre came a gilded bronze dove, sign of the Holy Spirit, announced by a radial spray of golden rays.¹⁸ When Bernini returned to the display of St Peter's throne some twenty-five years later he reinvented his earlier conception for the chair's new situation in the apse. Accounts of its genesis are contested in the scholarly literature;¹⁹ I shall limit my analysis to the glory that surmounts the throne (fig. 20). In the central aperture of the apse and between Michelangelo's monumental pilasters, an aureole of gilt-painted stucco clouds and cherubim surrounds an oval window of amber stained glass. From above and to the sides, gilt rays extend beyond the clouds as if emanating from the radial mullions of the window. Painted onto the centre of the glass is the dove of the Holy Spirit. As in a *Quarant'ore* display, light is orchestrated to emanate from the central sign of the dove, from which issues a profusion of clouds bearing angels. The billowing golden clouds and rays work from the depth of the window forwards, overlapping the flanking pilasters to 'enter' the space of the church. If the glory resembles the earlier decorative display of marble and alabaster of the 1630s for the throne of St Peter, it also speaks to the intertwining of the decorative and ephemeral arts in Bernini's work. The rich gilt recalls the Book of Revelation's dazzling imagery of empyrean light, which Bernini had rendered in burnished plaster clouds for *Quarant'ore* decorations, and in gilt-painted wooden shafts at the Cornaro chapel, but also the gorgeous materials of church treasure and the precious objects of altar decoration, rendered on a monumental scale. Documentary evidence establishes that Bernini built a model of the *Cathedra Petri* on site in the apse, on the basis of which he greatly increased its scale.²⁰ It was through this process that he came to use the *Baldachin* (fig. 21) to frame the viewer's approach up the nave of St Peter's towards this culminating vision of a fusion of heaven and earth. If Bernini drew the *Baldachin*'s form from ephemeral processional canopies and decorative ciboria, it may also approximate the structure of a monumental tabernacle designed to house an altar and its host. In this sense, too, the *Cathedra Petri* gives permanent form to features of a

Quarant'ore display, rising above and behind a tabernacle on an altar. The gilt clouds surround the throne, held aloft by the four doctors of the church in a structure that recalls the position of the monstrance in a *Quarant'ore* scenography, suspended by clouds and angels. It was from these intermediary forms of *Quarant'ore* scenographies and the lustre of liturgical objects that Bernini drew forth this visual vocabulary of the miraculous. If the Baroque glory borrowed from the visual lexicon of the marvellous devised for court entertainments, it became discrete by contingency, through its situation within a church setting. Thus, in a 'theatre' of miracles, Bernini's glory 'opened' the wall of St Peter's to reveal paradise.

Bernini's sculptural group representing St Teresa's miraculous ecstasy also sits above an altar. It is, in fact, an altarpiece, and is therefore linked to the ritual of the Eucharist (fig. 22). Along the front of the altar Bernini designed a relief decoration depicting the Last Supper in gilt bronze on a background of lapis lazuli (fig. 23). Inlaid into the floor on either side of the altar are two roundels of polychrome marble depicting intarsia busts of skeletons in attitudes of prayer (fig. 24). In the vault above, billowing out over gilt stucco reliefs, architectural ornament and a stained glass window, is a painted cloudburst of angels and cherubim, at the centre of which is the dove of the Holy Spirit in an aureole of light (fig. 25, and see fig. 1). The Eucharistic references in the chapel are full, running from the bread and wine of the Last Supper to Christ's Second Coming in glory, and the raising of the dead at the Last Judgment.²¹

Teresa's writings on her journey of prayer, culminating in visions and levitations such as the ecstatic transverberation that Bernini depicts, are replete with references to her visions of union with the godhead as a Eucharistic devotion. She envisages tasting God in her swoon, drinking of the chalice; there is an understanding of prayer as a metaphor for the bread of Christ's body, a vision of Christ Resurrected in the administration of the host. In keeping with her experience of ecstatic prayer as physically manifest through the vessel of the body – in levitations, faints and the mimetic knowledge of Christ's wounds – Teresa described her body as the tabernacle of her soul.²²

Bernini's sculptural group stands in an oval niche, framed by pilasters and columns and surmounted by an entablature. In respect of its oval shape, the front of the niche is bowed. Its form, as Lavin pointed out, resembles that of a tabernacle, one of those objects made to house the host, which were commonly circular or oval in shape. With decorative columns and entablatures they were fabricated as miniature architectural dwellings for Christ's 'body'. Usually made of precious metals, they had a door at the front, decorated with richly chased relief, which opened to reveal the host within.²³ In this regard we may view Bernini's niche as the open door of an altar tabernacle, for, unlike the classical statuary niche, the interior is wider than the opening. It is significant that verse written in celebration of the chapel referred to it as a *theatrum*, a 'theatre' of devotion within the larger space of the church, like that of a tabernacle or a *Quarant'ore* display.²⁴

On the flanking walls of the chapel are two sculpted group portraits of members of the Cornaro family in the tradition of funerary art. Bust length and of white marble, the figures sit behind a balustrade of coloured marbles that feign the fall of textiles hanging from a railing surmounted by a tasselled 'cushion' of stone. These marbled boxes recall those 'precursors' of the theatre box, the *palchi* of civic festivals, created when the façades of urban palaces bordering on large squares were dressed with

temporary balconies festooned with rich fabric hangings (fig. 26).²⁵ On either side the background behind the Cornaro portraits depicts columns, pediments, niches and vaults in an evocation of further architectural space extending to either side of the chapel like a transept.²⁶ This makes of the chapel a crossing, a church within a church. By long convention chapels were the place – *platea* – used for performances of sacred stories from the Bible and the lives of saints, played out within the ritualised sequence of the liturgy. These sacred enactments, composed of recitation, song, chant, prayer and tableau scenes, often constituted part of the service for the medieval feast days of saints, dwelling particularly on those miracles that formed the *raison d'être* of their sainthood. This was so for Teresa, the liturgy for her feast day, like that of her canonisation, comprising hymns concerned with her miraculous visions and ecstatic prayer: 'Come, sister, from the summit of Carmel / To the wedding feast of the Lamb. / Come to the crown of glory.' Written by Cardinal Maffeo Barberini as a hymn for the ceremony of her canonisation in 1622, this poetic account of her sanctity is given visual form in Bernini's figural group. It was sung annually at her feast day, and we may imagine the convergence of this hymn with Bernini's sculpture in Santa Maria della Vittoria, where art took the place of *tableau vivant*.²⁷ The flanking Cornaro cardinals look upon this vision of her ecstasy, consult books and dispute its significations among themselves. Below, the skeletons' gestures are of prayer and thanksgiving before this heavenly apparition of Teresa (see fig. 24). In a ritualised mimesis of faith, we may imagine the viewer's adoption of a bodily conformity to these effigied responses, in prayer and devotion. For the viewing faithful, the miracle was doubled: that of Teresa's view of paradise as the culmination of her ecstatic prayer; and Bernini's 'vision' of her miraculous transport.²⁸

Teresa's most celebrated account of the stages of prayer as a progress towards union with the divine, her *Interior Castle* or *The Mansions*, envisaged this in terms of passage through a series of halls or mansions. The means of entrance to the castle, and to the successive rooms within it, was prayer; in Teresa's words, 'The door is prayer.'²⁹ This metaphor of devotion as the door to heaven is a commonplace of biblical writing. It extends metaphorically to the body of Christ and so converges on the sacrament of the Eucharist. According to John's Gospel, Jesus said: 'I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved' (John 10: 9). Likewise the imagery runs through the passages of Revelation: 'After this I looked, and behold, a door was opened in heaven: . . . / And immediately I was in the spirit' (4: 1, 2). In Teresa's *Interior Castle*, the structure of prayer is a succession of entrances to increasing degrees of blessedness, in order to reach the highest stages of approach to the divine. The culmination of prayer was understood as entrance to the holy of holies, the *sancta sanctorum*. It is surely this that Bernini intimates in the structure of the niche, the door of the 'tabernacle' opening onto an inner sanctuary to reveal to the faithful this vision of heaven and earth conjoined in a manifestation of the higher, ecstatic phases of prayer.

Within the niche Teresa rests upon a marble cloud (see fig. 22). Behind, gilt-painted wooden rays signify the effulgence of divine presence radiating from above. Natural light from a skylight hidden by the entablature of the niche bathes the figures in a seemingly miraculous illumination. The glass for this window is today clear, but sources relate that it was originally yellow, lending the white marble a gold-tinged luminescence.³⁰ Further back, and flanking the niche, are inlays of alabaster and marble, maculated by cloud-like markings, dematerialising the solidity of the materials

with the illusion of cloud-like formations across their surfaces. Thus Teresa floats within a sky of clouds.³¹ The stones recall the similar use of clouded alabaster inlay for the first display niche of the *Cathedra Petri*. We may imagine this effect intensified by the smoke of candles on the altar, and clouds of burning incense. Moreover, the restoration of the chapel in 1998 revealed a channel running along the inside of the architrave around the bow of the niche, designed to house mirror-like reflectors. Now lost, these would have cast back on to the marble group the light from the oculus above, working to intensify the visual effect of a 'heavenly' aureole surrounding Teresa. Its purpose is confirmed in a letter from Francesco Borromini concerning some 'mirrors or steel reflectors' he wanted for the altar of Sant'Ivo alla Sapienza in order to forge a 'splendour' like that for St Teresa.³² If the term *splendore* recalls again the lights of a *Quarant'ore* display, the intent was similarly to heighten the illusion of divine presence, the 'vision' of a miracle.

Materials of Faith

In contrast to the white Carrara marble of the figural groups, the cladding of the Cornaro chapel is finished in an array of rare marbles and precious stones saturated in colour – alabaster, lapis lazuli, and different types of red, green, yellow and black marbles, all richly maculated. Bernini's orchestration of light heightened this effect, its concentration on Teresa and the angel bathing them in a celestial luminescence. This contrasts with the diffused and reflected lights on the darker surfaces of the chromatic surround, lending lustre to their polish. Altar candles, too, would have lit the chapel, their tremulous lights further animating the brindled variegation of the stones. Recent restoration work on the chapel uncovered further the wealth of the stonework, which mixes new marble with antique pieces, like a collection of the longstanding architectural deployment of *spoglia*.³³ The stonework draws on the *pietre dure* traditions of decorative art, used for costly inlaid objects, but here transposed onto monumental architecture to make of the chapel a kind of jewel box. Such display is in keeping with a biblical theology of jewels, which understood their splendour as signs of God's majesty. Teresa's *Interior Castle* is suffused with this metaphor: she envisages the soul in prayer as a paradisiacal castle of crystal or diamond, resplendent like an oriental pearl.³⁴ This devotional language arose particularly in allegories of the new Jerusalem as heaven on earth: 'For Jerusalem shall be built up with sapphires and emeralds, and precious stone' (Tobit 13: 16); its Christological reference to the Eucharist is made explicit in Revelation: 'And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven . . . And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men' (21: 2, 3). Within the church interior this concept of splendour as a manifestation of heaven was long evident in altar and tabernacle decoration, medieval traditions of a material spirituality upheld by the Council of Trent. In the words of Abbot Suger on the medieval altars of St Denis: 'out of my delight in the beauty of the house of God, the loveliness of the many-colored gems has called me . . . to reflect, transferring that which is material to that which is immaterial.'³⁵ In this sense the Cornaro chapel may be understood as a jewelled tabernacle, vessel to the host, and so vested in Christ's majesty.

Above, the painted vault of the chapel depicts an opening onto the heavens, an illusionistic conjoining of these two realms (see figs 1 and 3). Issuing from a glory of light, tiers of clouds bear angels making music. As the clouds descend from the peak of the vault to the adjoining walls, the plaster on which they are painted takes on increasing degrees of low relief so as to overlap the architecture. The clouds seemingly ‘drift’ into the actual space of the chapel. Their purposeful confusion of heaven and earth rests on an artful fusion of painting, architecture and sculpture. Thus the marvellousness of artifice lends seeming ‘presence’ to the miraculous.³⁶ Redolent of *Quarant’ore* display, the memory of these pious scenographies was surely potent for contemporary viewers, predisposing and intensifying by association their perception of Bernini’s illusion.

The Art of Ecstasy

On 14 March 1622 Teresa of Avila received sainthood through a ritual of canonisation at St Peter’s in Rome. In fact, this sixteenth-century Spanish mystic shared her canonisation with four others, two of whom were also her contemporaries, church figures of Catholic Reform and among its most important leaders: Filippo Neri, founder of the Oratorian order, and Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuits. Teresa, too, was the founder of a new religious order for women, the Barefoot or Discalced Carmelites. All three were renowned for their leadership within the church, and for their spiritual life. In Teresa’s case canonisation rested on the attested miracles of her journey through prayer. This is manifest in the bull of her canonisation, and was promulgated in the order of service, with readings from her writings on miraculous prayer, and hymns celebrating the significance of her visionary experiences.³⁷

The Roman diarist Giacinto Gigli gave an account of the processions, plays and decorations surrounding the canonisation, also described in a series of pamphlet-length *relazioni* of the event.³⁸ A print of the canonisation *teatro* in St Peter’s depicts a circuit of wooden arches surrounding the main altar to enclose the crossing (fig. 27). These were decorated with painted sculptures and great numbers of lit torches. The ritual enactment of canonisation took place within this space, to affirm the miraculousness of the saintly lives of the five. Suspended from above were the saints’ standards, textile hangings illustrating an episode from each one’s biography that was central to the claims made for their canonisation. These representations were also reproduced in print form, surrounded by eight smaller scenes relating further events from each saint’s life, all attesting the efficacy of their powers of miracle. In Teresa’s case the standard depicted her transverberation, a vision occurring during prayer in which her heart was pierced by an angel and so by love for God (fig. 28). The smaller scenes further elaborated episodes from her life in prayer. The disposition of narrative is similar in the Cornaro chapel, where the altarpiece depicts her transverberation while the reliefs in the vault portray related scenes of mystic prayer from her writings on her spiritual life. This great Catholic Reform canonisation, with its standards and prints, surely formed part of Bernini’s visual knowledge.

The conclusion of the ceremony of canonisation was heralded by trumpets, bells, cannon fire and fireworks. The day after, the saints’ standards were processed through the streets from St Peter’s, accompanied by music and thousands of candles, to the

respective host church of each saint. In Teresa's case this was a church of the Discalced Carmelites, Santa Maria della Scala in Trastevere. Each church had been decorated for the occasion, their façades a profusion of torches and lit up by fireworks, the interiors hung with paintings. The Jesuits staged a sacred drama combining ritual and theatre, which began with a descent from the clouds and ended with the heavens opening to receive their saints in glory.³⁹ Thereafter, on successive days, the different saints' feast days were inaugurated by ceremonies in their respective churches, attended by the pope and all the cardinals; the newly minted hymns were sung again and the canonical events from each saint's life were recalled through lessons and prayer. The annual office for Teresa's feast-day liturgy was decreed for the order of Discalced Carmelites from 1629, and was optional in all churches from 1633. By 1644 it was obligatory across the universal church.⁴⁰ We may thus assume Bernini's knowledge of this liturgy as he started to carve his *St Teresa* later in the 1640s.

Central to the order of service for her canonisation, and her feast day, was a reading from Teresa's writings on prayer, including the account of her transverberation:

It pleased the Lord that I should sometimes see the following vision. I would see beside me . . . an angel in bodily form. . . . He was not tall, but short, and very beautiful, his face so aflame that he appeared to be one of the highest types of angel who seem to be all afire. . . . In his hands I saw a long golden spear and at the end of the iron tip I seemed to see a point of fire. With this he seemed to pierce my heart several times so that it penetrated to my entrails. When he drew it out . . . he left me completely afire with a great love for God. The pain was so sharp that it made me utter several moans; and so excessive was the sweetness caused me by this intense pain that one can never wish to lose it, nor will the soul be content with anything less than God. It is not bodily pain, but spiritual, though the body has a share in it – indeed, a great share. So sweet are the colloquies of love which pass between the soul and God.⁴¹

As Lavin delineated in his analysis of the piece, Bernini's sculptural group draws deeply on Teresa's account but is not restricted to it. Similarly, Bernini's work is cognisant of the legacy of Teresan imagery (chiefly prints) but independent of it, seeking a confluence with other realms of visual representation too. The cloud on which Teresa rests is not part of the textual narrative of her transverberation. Instead it intimates a narrative conflation with other celebrated events from her life: related visions of the heavens and the godhead in the form of the dove of the Holy Spirit, with glories of angels and banks of clouds, as manifested in the frescoed ceiling of the vault, but also accounts of her death. In common with the Catholic mystic tradition, her death was considered a full union with the godhead, the consummation of a mystic marriage and thus the final goal of her journey in prayer; this is clearly referenced in the deathbed accounts.⁴² This fusion of the transverberation – a form of ecstasy characterised as 'struck through' in its force – with death characterised as an ascent into heaven, is also at the heart of the hymn for her liturgy composed by Maffeo Barberini:

This is the day when
Like a white dove
The soul of Teresa
Flew off to the holy temple of Jerusalem.
But a sweeter death awaits you

A milder penance calls
 With the dart of divine love
 Thrust into your wounds you will fall.⁴³

This convergence of ecstasy with death, central to the Christian mystical tradition and recurrent in the history of its written accounts, broaches a Eucharistic conformity. That is to say, Teresa's death from the wounds of love inflicted by the angel's arrow dramatises anew Christ's death by crucifixion. Prints from her life align these. In Adriaen Collaert and Cornelis Galle's 1613 illustrated edition of her *Vita* she is pierced by the arrow and receives Christ's nail in a vision (figs 29 and 30).⁴⁴ This bodily mimesis of Christ's suffering, again, lay at the heart of Catholic conventions of prayer and mysticism in this period. The faithful were enjoined to call to mind the physical details of Christ's passion as a stage of prayer, a widely propounded devotional practice best known from Ignatius of Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* written in the early 1520s. By means of this type of mimetic prayer, structured by the affective memory of bodily experience, the faithful might approach an identification with the godhead, culminating in a heightened and perfected conformity. This union with the divine may be termed a *jouissance*.⁴⁵ Its endpoint was death, like Christ's and in Christ, as Teresa's life of prayer was made to exemplify. Teresa died like a martyr for her faith, her death the longed-for culmination of spiritual love. This was in keeping with early modern Catholicism's broader invocation of the cult of martyrdom and the subject of much of its religious art.⁴⁶ In the words of a seventeenth-century devotional author that makes plain the anthropologists' link between sacrifice and resurrection: '[she] united herself living to her dead beloved so that through her ardour he might be revived'.⁴⁷

* * *

Exceptionally in Bernini's oeuvre, the Cornaro chapel brought no great production of verse by Rome's *literati*.⁴⁸ Discussion of the monument by Bernini's biographers is also disappointingly cursory.⁴⁹ Bernini's own judgement of it as his 'least bad work' was, instead, prescient, and one that the critical interests of twentieth-century scholarship have affirmed.⁵⁰ If it produced no extensive critical acclaim in its day neither was it the subject of enquiry, as were the ill-fated bell towers for St Peter's. It was, of course, a consequence of Bernini's disgrace at St Peter's that he was temporarily free of papal commissions and so able to take up the Cornaro request, and perhaps it was for the same reason that the chapel occasioned little comment. This lack remains a scholarly frustration.

Nonetheless, there is one anonymous critical commentary on Bernini's *St Teresa*, which, although long published, has not been fully integrated into discussion of the chapel. In quoting it, my intention is to address aspects of Catholic devotional belief systems at play in Bernini's *St Teresa* that are, in fact, historically central to the work. This text merits our attention, even if its purpose was to degrade the piece: 'in forming his St Teresa in the church of the Vittoria, [Bernini] dragged that most pure Virgin not only into the Third Heaven, but into the dirt, to make a Venus not only prostrate but prostituted'.⁵¹ The criticism touches, by inversion, on a conjunction of sensuality with spirituality fundamental to the church's mystical and Eucharistic traditions and to a significant strand of Catholic piety. The roots lie in an ancient perceived analogy between the union of 'man joined to wife' and the soul's desire for union with the

godhead. At its heart, this encompasses the experience of the body within the realm of the spiritual. Christ's valence was that of the spirit incarnate, embodied. He became flesh, the body the sign of his humility; his Resurrection too was bodily. Through a physical empathy with his sacrifice the faithful might approach an understanding of God's love. Within Catholic beliefs, the body's pain and pleasure could serve to lead the soul to God. This is manifest already in the ancient history of the Bible: the inclusion among its writings of Solomon's Song of Songs, today recognised as secular and deeply erotic love poetry, dates back to c. 1 BC. This poetry of sexual longing was read metaphorically as the soul's desire for God, and reworked in a continuous tradition across the Middle Ages and Renaissance. This interpretation is manifest throughout Christian traditions of mystical writings, including Teresa's, especially her *Conceptions of the Love of God*, and in those of her disciple, St John of the Cross, in his *Spiritual Canticle* or song. The perceived analogy between human and spiritual union was evident also in theophanies of mystic marriage, extended to individuals such as St Catherine of Siena and St Teresa, who were summoned by Christ as his bride in their visions through prayer. The church, too, became Christ's bride, in a conjoining of heavenly and earthly realms signified as the New Jerusalem, a metaphor that runs throughout the visions of the Book of Revelation and that played a fundamental part in constructing the Catholic experience of mystical rapture, including Teresa's, in terms of desire.⁵² This is acknowledged in her description of her transverberation: 'It is not bodily pain, but spiritual, though the body has a share in it – indeed, a great share.'

Our anonymous critic's attack on Bernini's *St Teresa* dwells specifically on the bodily representation of the saint, likening her pose to that of a reclining Venus. The history of Teresa's representation, manifest in surviving prints, clearly shows Bernini's departure from convention in the pose of the body. While the print for her canonisation depicts her standing to receive the angel's arrow (all five saints canonised that day are shown standing), she was more often represented kneeling in a conventional position of prayer (fig. 31). A frontispiece engraving by Jacob Honervogt for a textual compendium of Teresa's life, published by a Carmelite in Rome in 1647 (fig. 32), depicts her reclining in a swoon supported by one angel while another prepares to pierce her; equally, an earlier print for Collaert and Galle's 1613 edition of her *Vita* represents her levitating while praying in a kneeling position, pictorialised by showing her floating on a cloud well above ground and supported by a mandorla of light (fig. 33). Yet neither are 'sources'. Bernini subsumes both visual conventions to show Teresa half reclining on a cloud that suspends her above the floor of her niche (fig. 34). Her body is swathed in draperies, ample in their fall. Their plenitude connotes majesty, a beatific magnificence, but also the fullness of her spiritual knowledge. It is through the rendering of the draperies that we read, illusionistically, the disposition of Teresa's body beneath. High polish renders the drapery surface resplendent with cast light reflections. This is heightened through the rippling, crested torsion of the folds, forged through a deep undercutting. The vexed relief of the marble would have been further animated by candlelight, contrasting with the porous, rough-tooled surface of the cloud beneath her that absorbs and diffuses the light. The form of the angel beside her, arrow in hand, turns on a conflation of this heavenly apparition with an ancient Cupid type. His filmy draperies reveal the limbs beneath, in contrast to Teresa's heavier, enveloping folds that hide her form. The skin of the angel across the face and neck is wrought with a gentle, undulating relief to effect the softest transitions from light to dark, so forging

the illusion of a childish sweetness in the flesh. This reinforces the tender sway of his pose, one hand gently pulling back the drapery from her breast while the other prepares to pierce her heart again with the wounds of divine love, for Teresa's body is already shot through with its force, convulsed by the ecstasy of penetration. Her head is thrown back, her eyes rolled up in their sockets with the lids half closed, her lips parted by the 'several moans' – *quejidos* – of her description.

Let us turn again to early modern histories of Catholic devotion. Bernini's *St Teresa* and his *Ludovica Albertoni* have long been connected to seventeenth-century devotional poetry and tracts on the sweet sufferings of divine love.⁵³ This literature was always entwined with an embodied knowledge of human love, understood as the analogue of the divine. Thus, when Bernini's anonymous critic saw in *St Teresa* a 'prostrate Venus', this act of recognition rested on the historical force of the longstanding elision of sacred and profane love. Across the fused boundaries of the devotional and the secular, linguistic and visual representation, lay a shared engagement with an art of affect.⁵⁴ If Bernini's Teresa and the angel recalled an antique Venus and Cupid, this reference heightened its devotional effect. Yet the comparison of Teresa to a Venus also brings forward signal differences in the disposition of their bodies. The reclining Venus of the High Renaissance, in turn drawing on the long history of the ancient Knidian Venus, was paradoxically both nude and *pudica* – covering her sex with her hand.⁵⁵ Teresa instead is amply draped in an attitude of surrender. Her form is not an object of desire, but the agent and mark of her spiritual longing, aflame with love for God.⁵⁶ Teresa's pose has no clear antecedent in the history of her visual representation, although it does draw deeply on the bodily figuration of mysticism in High Renaissance altarpieces – of swooning Magdalens, of Mary at the cross, or of Caravaggio's *Ecstasy of St Francis* (fig. 35). The disposition of Bernini's Teresa surely originated within a nested triangulation of texts, prints and paintings; the ritualised gestures of religious devotion; and the imagery of mystical prayer.

More generally, Teresa's figural disposition draws on a larger contextual understanding of gestural language as both manifestation and carrier of the 'passions', which is fundamental to *seicento* art, ritual and theatre. Culminating in Charles Le Brun's great codified compendium of affects of 1698, *L'expression des passions*, this art was predicated on the figuration of the human body as sign.⁵⁷ Early modern acting manuals also dwelt on this, understanding the motions of the body as manifestations of emotional states. Thus the *moti*, the motions of the body, referenced the *emoti*, the 'passions of the soul'.⁵⁸ Indeed, the notation of bodily manifestations of affect, in both art and theatre, is central to seventeenth-century cultural history. This is precisely how Chantelou characterised Bernini's powers of acting: 'a talent for expressing things through word, expression and gesture, making these visible just as the great painters have done'.⁵⁹ In his art as in his theatre, Bernini drew on a common vocabulary of bodily figuration derived from the canons of classical art and ancient treatises on rhetoric, which were themselves fused and rested on ancient conventions of signifying gesture within ritual.⁶⁰

Studying Teresa's pose as we read it through the torsion of the draperies, we observe that she is half seated, half reclining, her legs bent at the knee, her torso curved (see fig. 34). The crouch of her body centres at the breast, where the angel's arrow pierces her through. From this arching contraction her head and limbs fall away – the head back, the arm to the side, the lower legs and feet beneath her, limp. The readings and

hymns for the liturgy for Teresa's canonisation and feast day centre above all on her transverberation and other experiences of ecstatic prayer. Any ritual enactment or *tableau vivant* of the type used to illustrate the reading would undoubtedly have choreographed the participant playing Teresa's part as kneeling in a pose like those represented in prints after her descriptions of miraculous prayer. There was thus no direct analogue to the sculpture's reclining pose in ritual gesture itself. Yet in the processes of prayer, in its structured interiority, we have a cultural practice through which to historicise Bernini's figuration of St Teresa. The myriad prayer manuals of the period taught the faithful to dwell on visual imagery of the lives of Christ and the saints, calling to mind the specificities of the martyred body and its glorious suffering as a means of heightening its spiritual intensity. If a devotional image might form the starting point of prayer, yet the progression of a prayer was not bound by that image. Rather, the supplicant's knowledge of biblical writings and the lives of saints, acquired through sermons, readings, sacred drama, liturgical enactments and devotional art, might interpose to suggest narrative action extending temporally both forwards and backwards from the moment in time captured in the image. Thus in the mind of the devout at prayer, the recollection of a figured iconography and of a textual narrative might fuse, with the effect of 'animating' the devotional image. In Loyola's exercises the supplicant is asked to 'picture the scene', to compose scenes such as the Nativity as a mental picture: 'is the place spacious or cramped, low or high, how furnished?'⁶¹ Teresa herself described her method of prayer as 'making pictures' in her mind.⁶² These conventions were longstanding within Catholic piety, the flowering of mysticism in the late Middle Ages being particularly rich. As Hans Belting, Caroline Bynum, Michael Camille and Jeffrey Hamburger have argued, medieval mystics like Catherine of Siena used images and scenographies as a starting point for prayer, to stimulate the visual imagination to 're-enact' the biblical scenes.⁶³ Such practices converged on those of religious drama, composed of *tableaux*, scenes strung together in a narrative sequence as part of collective prayer within liturgy. Thus cultural memories of sacred images and sacred performances might merge in the mind of the faithful during the exercise of prayer.

If images might represent textual descriptions of mystical prayer such as Teresa's it is also the case that her visions drew on Catholic worship's long history of giving visual form to the invisible, heaven and the divine, through art and theatre. Thus the structures of sacred art, ritual theatre and visionary prayer were linked. Within these devotional scenarios of their imagination, mystics drove themselves to experience their faith at once spiritually and (seemingly) physically. Thus they 'tasted' the blood of Christ's wounds; the Eucharistic bread miraculously 'became' Christ's flesh on the tongue; the Madonna lactated into their mouths to nourish them in their faith. These experiences of prayer elaborated the central Catholic miracle of transubstantiation during the mass, the real presence of the Eucharist within faith. If the medieval metaphors of the Eucharist are largely of food, as Bynum has shown, those of early modern Catholicism are predominantly of martyrdom, of union with God through the act of dying for, or of, your faith.⁶⁴ What is constant, in Teresa's words, is the 'body's share', the visible, physical manifestation of a spiritual state. The angel, 'all afire', pierces her with a flame-tipped arrow, igniting her love for God with his thrust. The wounds of love are also, metaphorically and in the end apparently literally, those of death. This mystical 'death' is the surrender of the self in order to enjoy complete union with

God. As Freud, Lacan and Kristeva have argued, the mystic's drive for spiritual ecstasy depends on a loss of subjectivity commensurate with a sexual surrender.⁶⁵ Devotional tracts from the period, including Teresa's own, as well as those of the late Middle Ages, draw on this metaphor insistently. Teresa describes a conversation in prayer with the godhead, occurring after taking communion: 'I was wondering what the soul does . . . , when the Lord said these words to me: "It dies to itself wholly, daughter, in order that it may fix itself more and more upon Me."' ⁶⁶ This 'death's' proximity to the bodily surrender of love is explicit in Teresa's gloss on a passage from Solomon's Song of Songs, from which she paraphrased 'Thy breasts are sweeter than wine' in her *Conceptions of the Love of God*. In keeping with its medieval antecedents of mystical writing, her reading rests on a full fusion of gender in its conception of the Sacred as a beloved, what she terms an 'excess of pleasure'. It is emphatic in its attention to the bodily – 'the kiss of His mouth' – configuring the swoon or 'death' of her surrender as a levitation:

But when this most wealthy Spouse desires to enrich and comfort the Bride still more, He draws her so closely to Him that she is like one who swoons from excess of pleasure and joy and seems to be suspended in those Divine arms and drawn near to that sacred side and to those Divine breasts. Sustained by that Divine milk with which her Spouse continually nourishes her and growing in grace so that she may be enabled to receive His comforts, she can do nothing but rejoice. Awakening from that sleep and heavenly inebriation, she is like one amazed and stupefied: well, I think, may her sacred folly wring these words from her: 'Thy breasts are better than wine.' For, when first in that state of inebriation, she felt it impossible to rise higher; but now that she finds herself in a loftier state, and wholly absorbed in God's indescribable greatness, she realises how she has been nourished.⁶⁷

Teresa's disciple, St John of the Cross, also composed his *Spiritual Canticle* as a Christian rendering of the Song of Songs, structuring it as a dialogue between the bride and her spouse. Here the instrument of penetration to effect the 'wounds' of love is understood as the eye, the arrow a metaphor for the visual ray.⁶⁸ It has often been suggested that Bernini's *St Teresa* takes its figuration from devotional prints illustrating texts based on the Song of Songs, particularly the widely read prayer manual / emblem book, the *Pia desideria* of 1624 by the Jesuit Herman Hugo.⁶⁹ Its final section describes the journey of prayer from desire through ecstasy to death as mystic union, based on a gloss of the Song of Songs. In its representation of 'swoon', the praying figure has fallen to the ground, supported by two attendants bestowing flowers and apples on her (fig. 36), recalling Solomon's bride's pleasure in 'his fruit . . . sweet to my taste' (Song of Solomon 2: 3). If *Pia desideria* informed Bernini's work it was not determining. What I have sought to bring to bear is a broader cultural history of Catholic mysticism and enacted devotional practice, both medieval and early modern, in order to give a historically contextualised reading of Bernini's choice of figural language in his *St Teresa*. It breaks with the Teresan iconography of prints, yet is fully imbued with Catholic conventions of mystical and ecstatic prayer as relayed through textual accounts both of its embodied 'vision' and of its means or process. If a recollection of Venus haunts Teresa's form, this is in keeping with the central tenets of an art of mimetic pathos, Warburg's *Pathosformeln*. Thus the bodily poses of the ancient gods might purposefully 'enter into' those of a Catholic art in order to intensify,

through the reach of cultural memory, the force of its affect: struck through with love for God.⁷⁰ This rests on a bodily recognition of the act of love on the part of the viewing faithful, apprehended through the cultural prism of Catholic mysticism's long history of conjoined 'devotions'.

Theatre of Miracles

Notwithstanding the paucity of literary reception for Bernini's *St Teresa*, there is a small cache of anonymous seventeenth-century verse on the Cornaro chapel. The recurring topoi within the poems are redolent of the period's critical marvel at art's illusions more broadly. The conceit that runs through them is of a doubled play between the miracle of Teresa's faith and that of Bernini's art. As Teresa 'dies' for love of God, Bernini's sculpture 'petrifies' her surrender. At the same time his art animates the stone, 'infusing life into the lifeless limbs, already full of God'. Coterminously it makes visible the ineffable, endowing a Catholic vision of the divine with a material presence. Thus 'the stone lives and dies', 'the loves of God and of the soul made visible', for 'in the dead marble both live the eternal life'. In a full conflation of art and its model, one verse describes the sculptor finding Teresa's form in 'the entrails' of stone, her effigy suffering real wounds in marble through the force of the angel's arrow. In another, the angel's quivering spear passes through 'the veins and bosom of the virgin' in 'cold, hard and obdurate stone'; 'She gasps, and heaves, and swoons. / She suffers, languishes, and seems to die.' Repeatedly the poets term Teresa's niche a *theatrum*.⁷¹ Thus the mystery of faith is embodied in stone, made 'present' to the faithful through Bernini's art, likened to that of a ritual 'theatre'.

In the years immediately preceding Bernini's work at the Cornaro chapel, Urban VIII made substantive revisions to the procedures for the canonisation of saints. This was manifest in an increased emphasis on the burden of proof of the miraculous, in keeping with broader tenets of early modern Catholicism.⁷² In art-historical terms the Cornaro chapel broached a deep intensification in its techniques of illusion to make manifest Teresa's spiritual calling. Through the artist's means of *techne* and conception, Bernini gave material presence to the impalpable, the visionary, the miracle of faith – hence the opening of Teresa's niche, which intimates the opening of a door, and the fictive sundering of the vault to the heavens to allow stucco clouds to float into the church interior, coupled with the optical deployment of natural light to render the central marble group numinous. These features, together with the gilded wooden rays behind, echo the scenographies of a *Quarant'ore* glory to suggest a Eucharistic reference in Teresa's vision, and in her 'death'. Recalling now the inscription on the banderole of the chapel's entrance arch – 'Nisi coelum creassem ob te solam crearum' ('If I had not created heaven I would create it for you alone') – we realise that these are the heavens God made for his beloved Teresa, bathing her in a glory of light.⁷³ This is redolent of the liturgy for the mass of Corpus Christi, where a heightened focus on Christ's body is represented by the metaphor of light: 'in order that, God becoming visible to us, we may be borne upward to the love of things invisible'. Similarly the marble cloud that supports Teresa and the angel signifies their miraculous transport, Teresa's visionary levitation. At the same time it is a miracle of Bernini's art to render the illusion of a marble so light that it rises and floats, suspended. The actual base of

the group is slender and placed well back so as to diminish the viewer's cognisance of it, obscured by the fiction of a porous, scudding cloud. The miraculous is rendered through the sculptural techniques of the marvellous.

In disguising the sculpture's base Bernini would seem to take up the legacy of the High Renaissance altarpiece, suspending his figures on clouds like a painter. From Raphael's Sistine Madonna to Correggio's domes, with which this chapter opened, the cloud as theophany was central to Catholic art across the early modern period. It was also, as this chapter has sought to show, the prevailing motif of its ephemeral ritual scenographies, notably the *Quarant'ore*. The dominant form by which to connote the heavens, the cloud motif runs through the biblical texts and so through subsequent descriptions of visions of paradise. For this reason it structured the experience of mystical prayer, in its visions of union with the godhead. Also ubiquitous in religious drama, it appears in the medieval cloud machines of the *sacre rappresentazioni*, extending to emergent forms of sacred theatre across the early modern period, from Stefano Landi's music drama *Sant'Alessio*, performed at the Palazzo Barberini in the early 1630s (fig. 37), to Jesuit productions in honour of their saints. As with the *Quarant'ore*, and manifest also in Bernini's great sun machine, cloud scenographies accompanied a display of light. In the darkness of the church interior this contrast seemed to make present the divine, 'the light that shineth in the darkness' (John 1: 5). Similarly Bernini's orchestration of light rendered palpable this vision of heavenly splendour. In the Cornaro chapel and the *Cathedra Petri* the light plays across the translucent whiteness of marble, or the sheen of gilt over wood and stucco, the artist's means to a material manifestation of faith. This art's capacity to transgress the boundaries of architectural and illusionistic space, with stucco clouds floating 'into' the church interior, also works to lend an embodied presence to the spiritual. Its intentional confusion of the visionary with the viewer's share in turn served the purposes of authenticating faith, touching on broader concerns of a reformed Catholicism. Incarnations of art, Bernini's church scenographies made present the miraculous. In the words of his contemporaries, 'Bernini works miracles', testament to this art's power of illusion.⁷⁴ At court this artifice occasioned wonder and marvel; within the church it signified directly the presence of a miracle of faith.

Pastorals

Along the base of Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne* (1622–5) runs an inscription carved in classical Roman lettering, which takes the form of a Latin epigram (fig. 38). Contemporary with the sculpture, its lettering imitates that of ancient Roman epigraphs. It is set within a fictive escutcheon and framed by the furled wings of a small dragon. The couplet is conventionally, and fittingly, translated in verse as follows:

The lover who would fleeting beauty clasp
Finds bitter fruit, dry leaves are all he'll grasp.¹

Now the relationship of this text to Bernini's sculpture has traditionally been understood by scholars as an iconographic equation of word and image. Carved for Scipione Borghese, the sculpture was made for his art collection, and housed at his newly built Villa Borghese, set among the vineyards of the Pincian hill just beyond Rome's entrance gate from the north (fig. 39).² In keeping with the sculpture's cardinalate patronage in a period of Catholic Reform, *Apollo and Daphne's* inscription has suggested Neo-Platonic interpretations of the piece as a vanity of earthly beauty.³ My purpose in this chapter is instead to propose a reading of *Apollo and Daphne* extending beyond that of a literary 'meaning' to one founded in a broader cultural field.

In raising the question of the relationship of text to image it is not, however, my intention to dismiss, far less to refute, a moralised reading of *Apollo and Daphne*, which has a basis in a range of textual sources from the period.⁴ Rather, my endeavour is to free the piece from the burden of fixed meaning. I will argue that, like so many private commissions of the Borghese court, *Apollo and Daphne's* address is open-ended. This culture delighted in a multiplicity of 'wandering' meanings, a euphoria of fluid and insistent allegorising, prizing objects and texts that gave free reign to a playful wit. *Apollo and Daphne* and its inscription were one such object, a courtly 'conversation piece' engendering a plurality of readings within the tissue of a ludic aristocratic learning. Its specific collocation in a villa further ties it to a firmament of noble pastimes, centred around an aristocratic construction of pastoral, that early modern idyll of the rustic. Its commission coincided with the death of the Borghese pope Paul V, and marked Scipione's retreat from political power, a retreat embodied by villa and the realm of pastoral. Comprising poetry, songs and plays, pastoral was at once the cultural face of *villeggiatura* (rural retreat), and a field of cultural performance. Thus the early modern Italian villa, its gardens and its art, hosted courtly entertainments studded by banquets *al fresco* but also pastoral plays, recitals of poetry and music, and gallery tours, its cultural aspects fully interwoven with its princely social life. In this regard the deployment of the epigram as an inscription for the sculpture is signal. Italian court cultures c. 1600 utilised the epigram in declaimed verse and sung madrigals, as well as carved inscriptions, and in a nascent art criticism. It is within this web of aristocratic conversation, song and verse on the art of pastoral that Bernini's sculpture, and its inscription, took form.

On the basis of the sculpture's couplet many scholars have worked the vein of early modern poetic conceit to contextualise the sculpture in the tradition of *ut pictura poesis*, that ancient equation of painting with poetry as parallel forms of representation. This has yielded a rich if limited interpretative field confined to text and image relations.⁵ I make strong use of this scholarship while seeking to extend its reach and above all to press on the cultural nexus from which these literary forms emanated. To bring this to light, the analysis delves behind the verse to find the broader milieu that produced it – the web of conversational performances out of which sculpture, music and verse issued, for these poems were not just literary texts but the social products of an oral culture of sung verse, *recitar cantando*. Finally, I have not neglected the sculpture's immediate physical context, that of the villa itself as a form of reflection on landscape in a pastoral vein through the lie of the building and its surrounding gardens, park and farmland. In keeping with the book's structure as the analysis of a series of social spaces in which Bernini's work 'performed', this chapter studies the princely art collection within the aristocratic villa as the locus that produced a work that was immediately, and still is, recognised as definitive both to his career and to the subsequent history of sculpture.⁶

Sculptural Poetics

The culture of the epigram, as a classical poetic genre, always bore close associations with song and with inscription. Originating in an archaic culture of sung verse, in antiquity it was above all elegiac, deployed in funerary rites and monuments. From this legacy it appeared in an array of linked cultural forms across the early modern period, including poetry, madrigals, inscriptions and emblem books. For *Apollo and Daphne*'s viewers these various textual and performed manifestations of the epigram were closely fused. Epigrams were commonly conceived, articulated and recited within shared conversational cultures of aristocratic leisure, which unfolded in the gardens and *saloni* of Rome's villas and palaces and among their collections of art. In fact the epigram became the favoured oral and literary genre for the reception of works of art in Borghese circles in the early years of the seventeenth century, when the *Apollo and Daphne* was carved.⁷ In a form of 'parlour game' viewers composed and exchanged epigrams among themselves on works of art they viewed socially and collectively to engender this conjoined literary–musical form.⁸ From antiquity it was a poetic genre conventionally used to convey, even to rival, the skill of the artist in describing a work of art. Thus it often converged with the classical literary tradition of *ekphrasis*, verse troped to 'give voice' to the work of art it described.⁹ The art object of the Borghese court accordingly arose enmeshed within a performance culture of sung or recited verse.

Much later in his life, Bernini recounted to his French chaperone in Paris, Paul Fréart de Chantelou, a story about the origins of *Apollo and Daphne*'s inscription, which sketches the web of courtly conversational play that surrounded the inception of the sculpture's carved verse:

When [Bernini] was working on the Daphne, Pope Urban VIII (then . . . Cardinal [Maffeo Barberini]), came in to see it with Cardinal de Sourdis [François d'Escoubleau] and Cardinal Borghese who had commissioned it. Cardinal de Sourdis

remarked to the latter that he would have some scruples about having it in his house; the figure of a lovely naked girl might disturb those who saw it. His Holiness [Maffeo Barberini] answered that he would attempt a cure with a couple of verses. Whereupon, he made an epigram from the fable of Apollo and Daphne; the story is that Apollo chased Daphne for hours; he was on the point of catching her when she was changed into a laurel bush, the leaves of which he grasped, and in the madness of love put to his lips. The bitterness of their flavor made him exclaim that Daphne was no kinder to him after her transformation than before. This was the substance of the epigram: The joy which we pursue will never be caught or, when caught, will prove bitter to the taste.¹⁰

Filippo Baldinucci also recorded the incident in his 1683 *life of Bernini* as follows: 'Because the figure of Daphne was so lifelike and true to nature, it was judged that it might offend a chaste eye. So a moral warning was attached to it. Cardinal Maffeo Barberini wrote it, and this noble distich was then inscribed [onto the base].'¹¹ Similarly, Bernini's son Domenico recounts the episode in his biography of 1713: 'Cardinal Maffeo Barberini attached the following verses to the figure of Daphne because she was a female nude, albeit made of stone. But because she was by Bernini's hand, it was possible that it might offend a modest eye.'¹² And in the same vein Bernini's French biographer, Pierre Cureau de La Chambre, described Maffeo Barberini's verses as 'serving like a veil' with which to cover Daphne's form.¹³

De Sourdis's regard for the young Bernini is not in doubt, and is made manifest in his commissioning a portrait bust by the artist to take with him on his return to France.¹⁴ Thus his apparent censure of Daphne may, I think, instead be understood as an admiring testament to the sculptor's disarming prowess. All the biographers' accounts describe Maffeo's inscription as an epilogue rather than instrumental to the sculpture's conception. In fact, Maffeo had composed the verse before work began on Bernini's sculpture; it formed part of a series of epigrams by Barberini on imagined works of art in a fictive gallery, a familiar poetic device from the period.¹⁵ What the anecdote reveals is the propensity of this patronage group to extemporise and recite before works of art as occasion arose. Bernini's circle of patrons, and the artist himself, were well versed in the literary legacy of the ancients, skilled in longstanding cultural modes of reinventing its stories in myriad forms. The biographers' story gives a rare glimpse of a social field of deeply learned conversations on the loves of the ancient gods, now largely lost, but manifest within this culture's art and literature. These objects and texts that have come down to us were fabricated from within a thick web of oral culture, collectively engaged with reworking the loves of the gods across the arts. The biographies give a flavour of this conversational culture, ceaselessly modulating while reinventing the ancient story of Apollo's love. De Sourdis's response was to the loveliness of Daphne's finish, his concern that some other might take offence. The conversation thus reflects a chivalric code prevalent in the discussion of art by early modern collectors, in which the female nude, in particular, figured as the embodiment of an art so lifelike it might displace an idealised beloved. In this vein the biographies relate that Maffeo Barberini recited the epigram as a means to counterbalance the overwhelming visual potency of Bernini's sculptural work. Baldinucci cites Daphne's miraculous lifelikeness – a familiar critical topos for Bernini's art – which the inscription was to tame. Similarly, Cureau de La Chambre's beautiful evocation of the inscription as a veil intimates a garment subsequently appended to the female form to lend

modesty. Domenico specifically suggests that the figure of Daphne was as if a live nude; although she was made of stone, in Bernini's hand she attained a fleshly presence that defied her medium. Seemingly possessed of Pygmalion's powers, Bernini gave her the semblance of life: she 'became' a female nude. Maffeo's inscription was to provide a reassuring textual definition of the piece that relegated the lifelike excess of the sculpture to the realm of an unspoken visual experience. But this story also makes plain that visual encounter might, as the French cardinal sensed, call forth very different reactions.

* * *

The story of Apollo and Daphne is an archaic one in origin, told and retold throughout ancient literature and beyond. The best-known version across the early modern period was from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, itself a composite text. Ovid's stories of the metamorphoses of the ancient gods enjoyed great prominence in early modern court culture. Their tales of marvellous transformation nurtured the cultivation of wonder in the same court circles that favoured the new technologies of rapid, seemingly magical, scenographic scene change in staged entertainments. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* were thus broadly disseminated in a plethora of translations across the sixteenth century and into the seventeenth, as the cardinals who viewed Bernini's emerging work surely knew. Successive translations and their differing emphases formed part of the rich textual legacy that Bernini and his audiences inherited. In Ovid's account Apollo is struck by Cupid's golden arrow which drives him to mad pursuit of Daphne. For her part Daphne receives the wound of Cupid's leaden point, causing her to flee love. At the point of capture the nymph Daphne cries out to her father, a river god. He responds to her calls by transforming her into a laurel tree, evergreen. The lovelorn Apollo presses the leaves to his lips to proclaim it his attribute. Twined into his hair and his lyre, the laurel would become the plant of poetry, and so of unrequited love, the poet's perennial theme.¹⁶

Poetic culture of the period, like the visual arts, endlessly reweave the fabric of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in myriad forms. Both drew on the rich legacy of Petrarch's love poetry, which was re-elaborated across the early modern era. Poets working the vein of Petrarchan imagery also turned to Ovid to write of love unrequited by a virtuous beloved beyond the reach of earthly affections. Sublimated into verse, poetry was consolation for the ineffable. Petrarch's Laura is, of course, a Daphne, for the tree that Daphne becomes is the laurel, the crown of poets. The evergreen into which the ever chaste Daphne is transformed emblematises her virtue. At the same time, it is Apollo's attribute, growing on Mount Parnassus, home to the muses' sacred grove of music and poetry. If music, like love, is fleeting and ephemeral, poetry is the cultural manifestation of unfulfilled longing, its sweetness a transformation of absence into verse. *Petrarchismo* coloured the early modern reception of Ovid, especially the story of Apollo and Daphne, which Petrarch had so densely reweaved into his own odyssey of love.¹⁷

Yet as the young Bernini worked another poet sought to reinvent the conventions of Italian secular love poetry. This was Giambattista Marino, poet of the marvellous, of a Baroque *concettismo*, or metaphorical language of conceit, that delighted in a richly saturated play of literary references, witty in its juxtapositions. Along with Petrarchan

conventions of love and poetry as the adumbration of loss, Ovid's story of Apollo embracing the poet's laurels was grist to Marino's imagination. Marino treated the story extensively, and variously: sometimes in Petrarchan mode, as in *La sampogna* (1620), where he reflects on poetry's role as consolation; sometimes reworking the story to conclude in a consummation of love in a garden of pleasure, as in his *Adone* of 1623.¹⁸ Thus the full resonance of Ovid's story for an early modern audience spanned a wide spectrum, encompassing the sweet sublimations of longing as well as the fleeting pleasures of possession.

Like the story of Apollo's pursuit of Daphne, accreted with centuries of readings, Bernini's sculpture gives visible form to the ambiguous, embroidered, even paradoxical and conflicting reception of Ovid's loves of the classical gods in early modern Rome. As the story of the cardinals' visit relates, this swollen legacy of interpretation was latent within the visual form. It has often been said that Bernini chose to draw on one of Rome's best-known antique sculptures, the *Apollo Belvedere* (fig. 40), as a source for his own Apollo. This much copied piece in the Vatican collection acted as a touchstone of an idealised classicism throughout the early modern period. Its youthful Apollo has just drawn his bow (now lost) by which means he will slay the Pythian dragon.¹⁹ Notwithstanding the violence of the subject, Apollo's stance is untroubled, his step light. In Bernini's imitation, likewise, there is no visual intimation of the Ovidian story's portent of violence; this young Apollo reaches for Daphne as a lover, his expression one of sweet solicitude (see fig. ●●). The forms of their heads draw together; while her feet move forward she arches back towards him as she turns. Viewed from either side their outflung limbs, flying draperies and hair form a series of arabesques around the figures to encircle them. Like Apollo's, Daphne's proportions are those of a classical beauty, a Knidian Venus, that sculptural form from antiquity that came to embody the beauty both of woman and of art.²⁰ These citations are in keeping with the villa's extensive collection of ancient sculpture and the reliefs that ornamented its façade (fig. 41), and are echoed in the classical lettering of the pedestal's inscription. Only the finely carved courtly dragon of the base, and the inherent allusion to the *Apollo Belvedere* as a Pythian Apollo, reference the primeval combat of Ovid's account. Yet the dragon was also a Borghese heraldic emblem, and the *Apollo Belvedere* was Rome's most celebrated classical sculpture; the abiding affect of these citations is not chthonic, howsoever this may be included within their signifying range. It is, instead, through Daphne's exquisite transformation that Bernini intimates the primitive and violent force of nature, fecund and generative to excess, claiming her youth and beauty in its prodigal metamorphosis. Her genealogy from the river, and projected union with the sun suggest a pullulating geniture, embodied in the bursting shoots of leaves, roots and bark, which the figures tame with their classicism (see fig. ●●). If Maffeo's inscription works to ease desire for Daphne's beauty, its purpose is surely also to assuage fear of her genesis, a fecundity coupled with the portent of death.

The sculpture's place was in a villa surrounded by domesticated vegetation: parkland trees that echoed its subject, and laurel growing in the garden just beyond the door of Daphne's hall.²¹ Yet this tamed nature, like Daphne, suggested the possibilities of a wilder vegetation that lay just beyond Rome's ring of suburban villas and cultivated farmland. Much of the delight of the piece, acknowledged by viewers of the period, lay in the sculptor's virtuoso mimetic handling of the marble to convey this oscillating

juxtaposition of rampant nature and civilisation's restraint: the lightness of leaves, the gnarling bark that rings her soft breasts, the tendrils of roots that halt her flight. Thus delight is dyadic, shot through with the inference of Daphne's loss. As Maffeo's epigram recounted, her loveliness could never be possessed.

Bernini's sculptures for the Villa Borghese were not alone among art works of the period in their capacity for polysemous readings or in their construction as 'visual songs'. Rome's courtly culture c. 1600 threw up other works of art on the theme of love that similarly played on a full spectrum of musical-poetic affects, albeit to different ends from *Apollo and Daphne*. Caravaggio's early portraits of young boys may similarly be read as visual constructs designed to elicit a plenitude of readings by their viewers; they include *Sick Bacchus* and *Boy with a Basket of Fruit*, which were among Scipione's acquisitions for the Villa Borghese. Scipione also acquired a now lost *Boy Bitten by a Crab* by Caravaggio, known to us through copies, which for a period hung in the same room as *Apollo and Daphne* at the villa, surely close in theme to Caravaggio's *Boy Bitten by a Lizard* (fig. 42).²² All have, like Bernini's sculptures, been variously read: on the one hand as vanities, and on the other as visual representations of the poetics of love, fleeting and transient as the bloom of youth, music or fruit.²³ In common with Caravaggio's other early portraits these works have been read as meditations on the poetic theme of love's sting, as with the story of Apollo's bitter chase.

Annibale Carracci's frescoes for the Galleria Farnese, also depictions of the loves of the gods, have similarly enjoyed interpretation ranging from moralised readings to an overtly pagan and even bawdy celebration of the pleasures and foibles of love (fig. 43).²⁴ In other respects, too, they have much in common with the works for the Villa Borghese. The Farnese gallery served as a space for entertaining, like the art collection of the Villa Borghese. Although concrete documentary evidence eludes us, it has often been suggested that the Farnese gallery was painted as a 'stage set' for the wedding celebrations of Duke Ranuccio Farnese to Margherita Aldobrandini in 1600.²⁵ We may imagine that festivities took place under Annibale's ceiling, wittily playing on the painted scenes above, which depict Olympian love stories. Throughout the ceiling, Annibale's paintings recount the overwhelming and transforming power of love, which made even the chaste aflame with desire, the majestic humbled by their passion.

The gallery's afterlife beyond the family wedding of 1600 appears to have been that of a scenography for courtly entertaining like the Villa Borghese. Scholars have proposed that Annibale's prominent representations of musical instruments throughout the frescoes suggest it was intended to be used for concerts, and its display of antique statuary along the walls indicates its function as an art gallery, where the Farnese might receive guests and make conversation about the works of art within.²⁶ Like the Villa Borghese, it would seem to draw together musical entertainment and the display of art. Similarly, the 'performance' of interpretations offered by visitors to the Galleria Farnese would have encompassed a wide spectrum, with both moralising and secular displays of eloquence on the significance of the classical narratives embodied in its art.

This prism of abundant ambiguities, seen as a source of delight, is a key to Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne*, and the collection of which it formed a part. Scipione deployed the works in his collection as a series of props to displays of virtuoso eloquence around metamorphic themes of the seductions, pleasures, hardships and foibles of desire, and the fleeting nature of love, youth and beauty, for which music's transience stood as a metaphor. The cultural milieu that both produced and received these works extended

their meanings through a range of enactments from conversation to poetry, music and performance, all of which drew out themes of learned delight. The figure of the early modern virtuoso fused the intellectual pursuits of the scholar with the social mores of the courtier, in keeping with the urbane nature of this court culture, to cultivate, above all, a learning allied with wonder, particularly in the forging of art's illusion. Delight (*delizia*) in its early modern etymologies carried allusions to allure as well as to desire – in this instance the allure of the object, which mirrors the viewer's desire. It embraced a gamut of inferences that Scipione's collection encompassed, and which crystallised above all in Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne*.²⁷

Scipione Borghese, delizia di Roma

As Paul V's chosen 'nephew' within a patronage system of pontifical nepotism, Scipione Borghese's position entailed a responsibility for the lion's share of papal entertaining, with the accompanying privilege of unparalleled access to pontifical funds.²⁸ Within the broad reach of his patronage the collection of art was prominent; he is remembered both for the ruthlessness of his means of acquisition, and for the prescience of his selection from the work of young artists. Typical of princely collecting of the period, the nucleus of his collection was constituted of antiquities – full-length figures, heads and also medals and coins – a preponderance belied by the present corpus of works in the Villa Borghese, for many of these antique pieces of sculpture were moved into the collections of the Louvre under Napoleon, and the villa underwent complete redecoration in the late eighteenth century.²⁹ Scipione's acquisition of works by Renaissance and contemporary artists was equally ambitious; indeed, artists vied for a place in this choicest of collections. He was also successful in appropriating entire collections from other collectors, such as the artist Cesare d'Arpino, and his fellow in the College of Cardinals, Paolo Sfondrato. Initially housing his art in other Borghese properties, chiefly the family palace in the Borgo,³⁰ Scipione then orchestrated the construction of a purpose-built home for his art collection. Situated among the remains of the classical villas of Lucullus, Pompey and Sallust, and modelled on literary descriptions from antiquity, Scipione's villa and its adjoining park and farmland drew on the rich literary, archaeological and agrarian associations of ancient *villeggiatura*. Yet its departures from this tradition are also signal. Built without bedrooms – there was none even for Scipione – it served only for entertainments hosted by the cardinal. The rooms, stripped of the usual domestic functions, were instead designed to house Scipione's collection, whose display formed a scenographic setting for his hospitality.

The Villa Borghese, being a building dedicated solely to the display of art, has traditionally been fêted as a harbinger of the modern museum. This has elevated it to a pivotal position within the history of collecting, yet the criteria for display of its works of art have more often met with dismay. Francis Haskell described Scipione's pattern of selection as without intention, notwithstanding its exceptional quality.³¹ Yet the principles of selection and display are surely those that served the villa's purpose, that of a scenography for aristocratic socialising and elite entertainment. While there are no overarching iconographic themes, yet the intention of the collection is clear: to

inspire delight. In this way the collection reflected the cultural identity of its patron, Scipione, known as the ‘delizia di Roma’.³²

Styled by this epithet, Scipione was further described as ‘umanissimo, cortesissimo, gentile, gioviale’, and as characterised by ‘affabilità, socievolezza’.³³ His title of ‘delizia’ was surely a reflection of the cast of his cultural patronage as well as his lavish entertaining. The objects he chose were charged with acting as ‘mirrors’ of this delight, with the capacity to engender a multiplicity of reflexive references to his princely identity. Displayed alongside art were collections of musical instruments, scores and singing automata, certainly intended to invite the participation of the cardinal’s guests in musical evenings as well as convivial tours of the gallery.³⁴ The objects of the Villa Borghese thus elicited all the pleasures and their affects, in keeping with Scipione’s cultivation of ‘delight’. This delight was socially constructed, to be shared and multiplied among Scipione’s guests, including Bernini, his close friend. I have here emphasised the literary and musical interests of the *Apollo and Daphne*’s patronage milieu, in light of which it is also instrumental to recall those of Bernini as playwright, who, according to the visiting Englishman John Evelyn, not only wrote the scripts of his plays but composed or set them to music.³⁵

As is commonly argued, Bernini’s *Apollo and Daphne* must be analysed in light of other art commissioned or collected by Scipione, for the collection brought together works by different schools and centuries, ancient and modern, religious beside secular pieces. Within a gallery visit the encounter with any single piece was surely mediated and contingent, heightened by the cultural associations of adjacent objects, their cumulative effects brought to the reading of each new piece. This was achieved also through the imitation of ancient sculpture in the collection’s modern pieces, as in the recollection of the *Apollo Belvedere* in Bernini’s *Apollo*. Thus the gallery visit was itself constituted in inter-visual terms.³⁶ Bernini sculpted themes for the Villa Borghese as varied as Aeneas and Anchises, Rome’s legendary ancestors, evoked by Virgil, and the Old Testament king David, slayer of Goliath; and of course the mythological pieces *Apollo and Daphne* and *Pluto and Proserpina*.

Among the many pieces of Hellenistic sculpture collected by Scipione for his villa was a reclining nude, unearthed in the gardens of the cardinal’s titular church of Santa Maria della Vittoria in 1608. The young Bernini was commissioned to sculpt a supporting mattress for the figure, which had arrived at the villa by 1620,³⁷ thus immediately preceding the commissions for *Daphne* and *Proserpina* (fig. 44). The figure has breasts as well as a phallus; there is evidence to suggest that Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte first posited an identification of it as the Ovidian story of Iphis, ‘a woman who woke to find herself a man’;³⁸ but it was soon linked with the story of Hermaphrodite and it is this identification that has prevailed.

Ovid recounts that this son of Hermes and Aphrodite, bathing in a pool, was desired by the lovelorn nymph Salmacis who, when he refused her, begged the gods to make their bodies one. Like Bernini’s *Apollo and Daphne*, this sculpture quickly gave a name to the room in the villa in which it stood. While the sculpture itself bears no inscription, a bronze copy by Giovanni Francesco Susini of 1639 (fig. 45) has two epigrammatic inscriptions, which originally may also have been displayed with the marble piece. The first inscription invites us to admire the beauty of two forms within one body; the other warns against the doubled depiction as a visual metaphor of duplicity, effected through its seductive charm:

Behold a double form in one body:
 Wonder at its beauty.
 You will often find a double heart in one breast.
 Beware of treachery.³⁹

The inscription speaks to the visual work of the representation, that of a doubled pleasure, a surfeit, inviting the viewer to look on it with wonder. Yet at the same time it undercuts this with a reflection on duplicity that seeks to tame its plenitude. Although we have no details as to how this doubled couplet emerged, the evidence concerning Maffeo Barberini's composition of verse for *Daphne* and *Proserpina* suggests a similar gestation for the inscription, born of social engagement with the piece by its viewers. The Villa Borghese *Hermaphrodite* was displayed differently from *Daphne*. It was housed in a walnut chest, decorated with carved *putti*, foliage, dragons and eagles, to be revealed when Scipione wished. This has been analysed as a cautionary measure in view of the sculpture's subject, and it may be so. But it was surely also a scenographic conception of display, based on the spectacle of revealing the sculpture's dualism, a means of heightening the element of surprise for the visitor through a doubling oscillation between covering and uncovering.⁴⁰ The back view of the sculpture presents as a reclining female nude; it is only by moving around the piece that the viewer apprehends the dual sex, a plethora of pleasures also marked by excess. *Apollo and Daphne*'s rampant verdure and consequent doubled identity echoes the *Hermaphrodite*'s glut of members, albeit to different ends; both offer a profusion of beauties that is also a deformity, kindling desire touched by horror.⁴¹ Their ambiguous identities are amplified by other pieces in Scipione's collection, notably Caravaggio's early paintings of young boys that also play on sexual ambiguity, and that concomitantly hover between portrait, genre and history painting to defy easy definition as works of art.⁴² Like Bernini's mythological works for Scipione, these paintings lend themselves to the Borghese court's cultivation of what Emanuele Tesauro would later term 'wandering' meanings, ambivalent and so mutable, multiparous and metamorphic.⁴³

The closest parallel to Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne* is with his *Pluto and Proserpina* (fig. 46), also Ovidian in theme, also executed for Scipione and then given to the newly acceded papal family, the Ludovisi, for their villa.⁴⁴ *Apollo and Daphne* was seemingly commissioned to replace *Pluto and Proserpina*, so the links are surely tight. Again, the story is an archaic one, best known in the seventeenth century through Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Like the story of Daphne, Proserpina had for centuries accrued various moralised, Christian interpretations, in which the cycle of the seasons, of death and rebirth, heralded by Proserpina's springtime return from Pluto's underworld, was held to allegorise Christ's Death and Resurrection. But these meanings are scarcely exhaustive. In archaic versions Proserpina embodied fertility rituals of coupling and sacrifice to secure a good harvest. Yet poetic traditions reweave this story of the loves of the gods as one of abduction, consummation, lost innocence and generation.⁴⁵ Thus, like the myth of Daphne, Proserpina's was an unstable sign, fecund in interpretation and fraught with oscillating contradictions. While the intimation of rape in the story of Apollo's pursuit of Daphne is reworked as a lover's caress in Bernini's sculpture of this pair, his rendition of Pluto's brutal grasp of Proserpina, her struggling limbs and her tear-marked face make bodily acknowledgement of the violence that haunts myth's narratives (fig. 47).

As with Daphne, Maffeo Barberini composed a distich on the story of Proserpina which was also inscribed into the sculpture's base:

Oh you who stoop to pick the flowers of the earth
Behold how I am abducted to the dwelling of wild Dis [Pluto].⁴⁶

The conjunction of this text, spoken in the fictive voice of Proserpina, and the object suggests that the words issue from her open mouth like a cry to all who look upon her naked beauty. The sources provide no elaboration on the circumstances in which Proserpina acquired her powers of speech but, as with Daphne, words serve to tame a stirring visual pleasure. Like *Apollo and Daphne*, the juxtaposition of inscription and image is open to a range of interpretations. The text interrupts the visual potency of the piece with discursivity.

Arcadias

In keeping with the innumerable antique references of the villa's collection, its architecture and interior decorations also drew on mythological themes. A ceiling fresco by Giovanni Lanfranco of a cloud-borne Council of the Gods ornaments the loggia of the Villa Borghese, that architectural space 'between' building and grounds that underscores the close ties of a villa to its garden (fig. 48). Lanfranco's imagery makes reference to the cyclical changing of the seasons engendered by Pluto's abduction of Proserpina, as well as to mythology's lost 'golden age' of unfettered delights, the first age of man described by Ovid in his classical account of creation.⁴⁷ Characterised by an innocent pastoral freedom, without need of the law or of toil, here spring brought forth fruitful abundance and Olympian couples took their pleasure.

Visitors to the extensive grounds of the villa were greeted by a (now lost) Latin inscription of welcome to those within circles of friendship and civility, which, like Lanfranco's fresco, bound the garden's myriad enchantments to those of a golden age from the mythical past. Along with the verses for *Daphne* and *Proserpina*, scholars have attributed it to Maffeo Barberini:

I, custodian of the Villa Borghese on the Pincio, proclaim the following:
Whoever you are, if you are free, do not fear here the fetters of the law.
Go where you wish, ask what you wish, leave when you wish.
These delights are provided more for visitors than for the owner.
As in the Golden Age, when freedom from the cares of time made everything
golden,
The owner refuses to impose iron laws on visitors who linger here.
May the friend find goodwill here in the place of the law,
But if anyone with deceit and intent should transgress the golden laws of
hospitality,
Beware lest the custodian break the token of friendship.⁴⁸

Through these words, an invocation of a lost golden age 'free from the cares of time', their author cast the villa within the realms of a mythic cultural past. The topos of a golden age connoted a mythologised geography as well as a fictive history. It was conflated with poetic conventions of Arcadia, that mountainous and remote part of

the Peloponnese, peopled by shepherds and eulogised by urbane classical authors as still living in the manner of mythology's archaic past. Thus Arcadia came to represent a pastoral idyll of unhindered bliss, a myth of origin of rustic simplicity, constructed geographically in terms of an opposition between city and countryside. If city life was that of linear time, history and *negotium*, then *villeggiatura* was a place of *otium*, marked by a timeless absorption in rustic but also cultivated pursuits. In this way the villa came to embody a place of retreat, of 'otium studiosum', in which historical time might be suspended, mythically vanquished by the power of culture, art and literature to bring back the past.⁴⁹ This was surely intertwined with the seemingly timeless rituals of the agrarian calendar. Yet *villeggiatura*'s cyclical marking of the seasons deferred but could not subvert the course of linear time. Hence reflection on a golden age of innocence was of a sweetness mixed with poignancy. Its invocation was suffused with both the nostalgia of longing and the acknowledgement of things past. Like the transience of love, youth and beauty, its pleasures were tinged by the prescience of loss. This literary trope already governed the manifestations of pastoral in the texts of the ancients, for Virgil's bucolic evocations of country life were of a 'locus amoenus', a rustic retreat configured as a dream-like place, free from the cares of *negotium*, where the loves of the gods unfolded. The golden age was a mythical history of dallying Olympians conflated with Pan's pastoral realm of coupling shepherds and woodland nymphs, in turn projected onto the gentle wilderness of an imagined Arcadia.⁵⁰

This mytho-poetic realm of sylvan woods was also home to the muses, goddesses of the arts, comprising music, song, dance, theatre, poetry, history and memory. Originally nymphs and companions to Apollo in his capacity as patron of music and poetry, the muses gave their name to the 'museum' as the locus of memory. Its stores of objects, fragments from the past, constituted a means to relive lost or imagined worlds. The marvels of antiquity, both fictive and antiquarian, came together as parallel sources of delight. It took its name from a room devoted to study and dedicated to the muses in the fabled ruins of Pliny's villa, an archaeological commingling that reverberated through the architectural and cultural history of the early modern revival of the villa 'all'antica' and the convergent development of the museum as embodied by the Villa Borghese. Villa gardens sought to invoke the classical realm of *locus amoenus*, the setting of pastoral love, just as the poets did. Classical statuary punctuated every part of their grounds, so that walks and views might be imbued with fragments of the ancient past. Because the Pincio had been home to villas and gardens in antiquity it was rich in archaeological recollections and fecund with their literary associations, which the scale of Scipione's collection could encompass. Panegyric poets frequently cast Scipione as a new Apollo to celebrate the reach of his cultural patronage as a new protector of the muses, heir to the legacy of ancient myth.⁵¹ Thus might the remains of the antique world, as in Scipione's collection, act not only as repositories of historical knowledge but also as agents of imagined, poetic encounters between two worlds, past and present. These fragments engendered a reverie of communion with the past. The poignancy of the pastoral genre turned around a dream-like suspension of time, like that of *otium*'s release from *negotium* and similarly shadowed by the knowledge of its fugitive pleasure. This paradoxical affect of ineffable sweetness haunted by the foreknowledge of loss found expression in the loves of the classical gods in Arcadia, those narratives of unfulfilled longing like that of Apollo for Daphne.

As shrine to the muses, the *museum* was also properly a locus of performance – of poetic recital, song and dance, and theatre of comedy and tragedy. Similarly, the Virgilian eclogue positioned itself as the fruit of singing contests between Arcadian shepherds, on the subject of the loves of the gods in the pastoral realm. Specific to *Apollo and Daphne*, the form of address to Apollo within mythological tradition was that of song. This rich and intertwined archaeological–literary heritage inflected both the revival of the classical villa and a nascent pastoral literature of verse, theatre and music, embodied at the villa in Scipione’s collection of antiquities alongside art, musical instruments and scores.⁵² Scipione’s collection of musical scores, composed chiefly of madrigals, epitomised the proximity between the epigram, the inscription and the sung madrigal at this historical juncture, born of a common antique heritage. Scholars of Italian music and theatre have long noted the efflorescence of musical performances of the loves of the gods, especially Daphne, and Apollo’s son Orpheus, c. 1600, within circles of patronage close to Scipione. This clustering of musical recitals of epigrammatic madrigals on pastoral themes came coupled with what, teleologically, is recognised as the emergence of opera. It is acknowledged as originating in the search for the music of the ancients, known from texts for its powers of affect but for which no music as such remained. Drawing on sixteenth-century traditions of the pastoral play and of the madrigal its characters performed in *recitar cantando*, a fusion of reciting and singing.⁵³ The choice of the pastoral setting was deliberate, based on the speculation that Arcadians naturally spoke in musical verse, as in Virgil’s singing contests; in that age, in the words of the music historian and theorist, Giovan Battista Doni, ‘music was natural and speech was almost poetry’.⁵⁴ These theoretical developments are attributed to the intellectuals of the Florentine Camerata from the 1580s on; early pastoral operas were not only performed within academies devoted to music, such as the Camerata, but also quickly became part of aristocratic entertaining within Italy’s court culture, playing to coterie audiences of invited guests in private noble households such as Scipione’s. In tune with their pastoral themes, these performances were often given outdoors in rustic settings, which the villa’s gardens and parkland, populated with antique statuary, provided so well. Thus the physical space of the villa became, through its performances as well as its sculpture, the site of encounters associated with a commingled social-cum-literary reverie of pastoral myth.⁵⁵

The Villa Borghese’s inscription of welcome, invoking the physical medium of the villa as a means of transport to a mythic past, was displayed on a piece of garden architecture, Girolamo Rainaldi’s *teatrino* (fig. 49). This forms a facing wall at the end of a long pathway leading from the villa to the furthest limit of its formal garden. Once decorated with reliefs, busts and masks, it frames a hemispherical space appointed with columns, sculptures and stone seating, designed to accommodate the courtly performances of aristocratic entertaining – comedies, recitals, song and music.⁵⁶ Its designation as a ‘theatre’ is representative of the use of the term in this period, to signify an architectural construction, reminiscent of the ancient amphitheatre in the hemispherical shape it demarcates and in its consequent circumscription of a space suitable for entertainment or display.

Notwithstanding the flurry of archival research surrounding Scipione and his villa for the publications that celebrated its restoration and reopening in 1998, little has come to light regarding entertainments at the Villa Borghese, with only passing details of visits, banquets and performances that took place there.⁵⁷ Yet this villa, rooted in

the emulation of those of ancient emperors, surely served also to imitate their entertainments. Its guests without question brought the memories of *villeggiatura* with them as a cultural frame. Beyond the rustic pleasures of hunt and harvest, these included the Ciceronian pursuit of study and learned conversation, but also recitals, readings and performances of music and drama that characterised elite leisure and which we may extrapolate from our knowledge of entertainments at other Roman villas across the early modern period. Anton Francesco Doni's manual of villa life of 1566 described the villa as a place for feasts and banquets, accompanied by music and the performance of plays.⁵⁸ The Chigis' Villa Farnesina boasted a podium in its grounds to serve for open-air performances of pastoral plays or the recital of Virgilian eclogues following princely banquets. The many garden *teatri* of the Villa d'Este hosted virtuoso displays of fountains and water-powered automata or mechanical figures that commingled with its antique statuary, inviting guests to visit the gardens and partake of supper parties accompanied by philosophical or antiquarian conversation. Guests at Caprarola viewed the villa's paintings as after-dinner entertainment, engaging in the conversations of an emergent connoisseurship.⁵⁹ In these latter two examples we see a convergence between forms of elite hospitality and the activities of the early modern Italian 'academy', whose intellectual pursuits were generally conducted by means of conversation, with improvisations on a given theme, and were often hosted by its members in their private houses. In many, guests composed and recited extempore speeches, verse or song on a chosen word or an art object, real or imagined. Scipione's closest court intimates, including Maffeo Barberini, were members of Rome's Accademia degli Umoristi, whose meetings Scipione sometimes attended.⁶⁰ A group with a literary bent, its discussions centred on pastoral verse and the nature of love poetry; and it is from this circle that some of the earliest verse composed about Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne* emerged. A madrigal by Antonio Bruni in praise of the piece turned on a parallel between sculpture and musical verse, likening Bernini to Amphion and Orpheus, the great musicians of mythology who could animate stone with their song:

Praise the beautiful Daphne
Sculpted so alive
By [him] who also gives marble both sense and life;
Only you can praise her,
You, Thracian poet, Theban swan
You seem with your odes:
Here comes a sovereign sculptor,
So that you, new Amphion, newborn Orpheus,
From your song to the trophy
Draw trees, stones and rocks. Who transforms her
From one form to another,
And shows her gracious to your lyre,
Now transformed into a wail, and now into stone.⁶¹

Bruni's verse exemplifies the much broader cultural practice of poetry composed in response to works of art, which bestow the qualities of life – speech, movement and in this instance song – upon the inanimate and silent object, 'now a wail, now a stone'. Contemporaries likened Maffeo's palace to an academy for Rome's most famous men

of letters and science: 'There one enjoyed noble virtuoso conversation on every discipline.'⁶²

To return to entertainments staged at the Villa Borghese, a rare detail relates that Lelio Guidiccioni, both court poet and connoisseur of art for Scipione and a lifelong intimate of Bernini's, gave tours of the art collection to his patron's guests.⁶³ The evidence may suggest that the art tour, like the forum of the academy, became an occasion for impromptu performances of recited verse by invited visitors as encomia to the works of art on display. If so, the world of the academy converged with that of the art gallery tour, to produce a profusion of verse on art. My analysis both of specific pieces and of Scipione's collection as an ensemble proceeds from within this dense historical web of pastoral plays, verse, music and performance; of bucolic social entertainments and conversation; of antique statuary as signposts by which to engender reverie of a lost 'golden age'; and of the collected objects as sources of protean delights and manifold meanings. This abundant range of references might be played out in the social space of the gallery tour and the connoisseurial conversations it brought forth among those 'knowledgeable about art'. It is to the tour of the art collection and the performances it engendered, both social and literary, material and fictive, that I now turn.

* * *

Maffeo Barberini's inscriptions for Bernini's *Daphne* and *Proserpina* first formed part of a collection of epigrams written in his hand entitled *Twelve Distichs for a Gallery*. It consists of twelve verses on mythological subjects, accompanied by brief descriptions of imaginary works of art.⁶⁴ The verses speak as if in the voice of a visitor responding to what is on view in the gallery, or alternately as if from the work of art itself. In fact, Barberini's text forms part of a genre of poetry that flourished in Rome's academies at the turn of the seventeenth century, structured as an imaginary visit to an art gallery with a 'dialogue' between objects and visitors. Annibale's ceiling for the gallery of the Palazzo Farnese, with its fictive frescoed display of paintings, reliefs and medals to feign a further imaginary collection on the vault, would seem to constitute a painted version of this literary form (see fig. 43).

The most celebrated poetic instance of the genre is Marino's *La galleria* of 1619, which the Neapolitan poet conceived of as a visit to an imaginary art collection, using epigrams to describe the illusionistic force of the works.⁶⁵ Other examples of this genre include several descriptions in verse of the Borghese collection,⁶⁶ among them a 'song', or *cantata* written by the Borghese court poet, Scipione Francucci, in 1613. In common with other court poets writing in celebration of their patron's art collection, Francucci's panegyric takes the form of a seeming enchantment in which the viewer/reader pretends to 'see' the works of art come to life. This became a kind of set piece within seventeenth-century opera, the 'ballo delle statue', in which actors guised as statues within an architectural stage set seemingly came to life, stepping from their niches to dance and sing.⁶⁷ Francucci describes the Borghese works of art by means of the familiar ruse of a fictive visit to the collection, in this instance by Apollo in the company of Fame, Painting and Sculpture. The poem celebrates a playful confusion between social and mythical visitors, human and artficed figures, within the gallery, recreating in verse the type of princely visit to the collection that surely

produced it.⁶⁸ It describes the Galleria Borghese as ‘a theatre of the universe, a compendium of marvels and a delight to the eye’. Within this theatre, sculptures and viewers at times change roles so that objects become spectators to the *theatrum mundi* of their visitors: ‘the gallery opens its doors . . . to the world’s theatre’.⁶⁹ The ‘living’ are so enchanted by the marvels of the sculpted figures that they mirror their frozen poses; concomitantly the marble seems to take up the lively motion of its viewers. These tropes run throughout literary reception of art in this period: art’s powers of illusion are those both of Pygmalion in bringing to life the inanimate and of Medusa in capturing the viewer in her metamorphic stare. In Francucci’s verse the works of art are deemed so vivid as to vie with visitors for that claim:

You alone, Apollo, among a thousand Apelles,
You can bring the works to life.
Melodious painter, loquacious sculptor,
Give lifelike accents to that which speaking, falls silent.⁷⁰

The poem opens with the conceit of an empty gallery; with the arrival of its august visitors the rooms come to life, populated by both the live and the artficed figures, now animate. Dedicated to Scipione as a new Apollo, the poem wilfully confuses the literary with the social sphere, so that its allegorical visitors include the villa’s guests. Their performance is playful, partaking of an early modern delight in this fiction. While the artist may endow the works with the visual qualities of lifelikeness, it is only the presence of visitors that brings them to life and, through conversation, gives voice to the otherwise silent figures. The means of their transformation is wrought by ‘lifelike accents’ – of the voice but also, metaphorically, of the painter’s brushstrokes and the sculptor’s chisel. Another poet of the Borghese court, Ludovico Leporeo, similarly described the garden sculptures of the Villa Borghese in his 1628 encomium as:

A thousand gods pressed into service
In the park’s fountains and in the garden
And on the palace placed on guard
In the open air they stand, whether it snows or rains.⁷¹

As with Francucci, the abiding conceit is that of animation; the sculptures take on the role of Scipione’s guards and retainers. Art’s powers of illusion can transfix its viewers into would-be statues because it can stun them with its seeming transformation of matter into ‘life’.

Metamorphoses

Looking again at Bernini’s *Apollo and Daphne*, we see that it is the very moment of the story’s transformation that he depicts (see fig. ●●). From behind, Apollo’s left arm at last encircles Daphne’s waist. Her open mouth cries out in response to Apollo’s touch and at this moment her metamorphosis begins. At the same time, Bernini’s artistry performs another kind of metamorphosis, that of artistic illusion. His consummate powers succeed in sculpting a dense mass of marble into the etiolated lightness of leaves, the warm softness of Daphne’s stomach into which Apollo’s hand begins to

press (see figs 50 and 51). It is a visual *double entendre*, for in the same moment that Bernini makes marble into flesh, he also transforms flesh into corrugated bark.⁷² Indeed, Apollo's hand presses to Daphne's stomach to touch both her flesh and her arboreal transformation (fig. 50). If he does not yet see Daphne's metamorphosis, he already knows it through touch. Like Francucci's poem, this metamorphosis forms part of an aesthetic of wonder and delight, a play of oppositions, as stone becomes art, and art takes on the semblance of life.⁷³ Ovid had described Daphne as 'growing pale'; Bernini's marble redoubles this transformation, rendering the illusion of tinted flesh in white stone.

This culture's engagement with mimesis as the object of art sought a synaesthesia of the optical effects of light and shadow with the haptic apprehension of texture in order to render the illusion of artistic 'presence'.⁷⁴ A sweet, pleasing softness, effected by means of imperceptibly gradual transitions from highlights to shadows, was a much prized early modern visual quality. It was the ability to render this that had given painting the advantage over sculpture in the sixteenth-century *paragone* debate, and, as has often been pointed out, Bernini undoubtedly sought to challenge this.⁷⁵ Hence the softly yielding flesh of Proserpina's thigh where Pluto's fingers press (fig. 51); or the plumped-up springiness of the mattress into which Hermaphrodite sinks (see fig. 44). It was these oppositions that opened up interlocutory space to elicit bodily response, the tactile acting as a 'calling structure' to solicit the viewer's touch. For example, Charles de Brosses remarked that Bernini's sculpted mattress compelled one 'to pass one's hand over [what] is no longer marble'.⁷⁶ At the close of the century, another visiting Frenchman, François Raguenet, similarly testified to a sculptural illusionism that elicited visual, mental and bodily participation: 'all feel . . . the hardness of marble, resisting where it would have been natural to believe that one's finger would sink in'.⁷⁷ Similarly the viewer's engagement with Daphne is surely to mimic Apollo's reach across her stomach, to 'touch' both its soft swell under pliant skin, and the growing bark that now consumes her. Daphne's flesh is finished with fine abrasives yet without a high polish, the gentle-grained surface diffusing light reflections to render the illusion of a tactile softness. The lure of touch is constructed both within the body and on the surface of the work. The sculpture offers the viewer a multiplicity of textural effects, for this is the subject of the piece.⁷⁸ The viewer's bodily response is two-fold. Through a mimetic conformity to the figures, the viewer mimes Apollo's desire to possess Daphne through the outstretched arm; at the same time we echo Daphne's cry, giving voice to the piece like Maffeo Barberini in his verse. Yet the Apolline reach is also that of the gallery visitor and connoisseur, an attempt to possess a tactile knowledge of the marble surface, variously to 'touch' and so to seek to trace the sculptor's means to his multiple illusions of skin, bark, hair, leaves. The first serves the progress of the narrative, intimating the moment of possession that should follow as Apollo/the viewer seeks to fold Daphne back into his arms. Yet the variegated surfaces of her metamorphosis arrest our visual attention with description. The skin of the marble is thick with traces of Bernini's handling, variously worked to illusionistic intent. Saw, chisel, hammer and file render the myriad surfaces, animating the skin of the piece. There is within the work a series of visual 'digressions' that stand in tension with the thrust of Apollo's action, holding the viewer in a pleasurable suspension between narrative and artistry that defers both the possibilities of possession and the transformation that is its source. In this sense Maffeo Barberini's inscribed verse

would seem to 'give voice' to the sculpture's representation of desire as ineffable, its fulfilment always beyond reach. Apollo's connection with a lost antiquity through the figure of the *Apollo Belvedere* likewise both summons up and marks the distance between the ancients and Scipione's present. Throughout, the villa's fragments of antiquity mirror this paradox of desire both to possess the past and to mark its passing. This is in keeping with the Petrarchan vein of poetry, long linked with Bernini's Ovidian works, which mourned the impossibility of fully re-entering the ancient world as sweetly as Petrarch longed for his elusive Laura.⁷⁹

Musicologists have analysed structures cognate with Bernini's sculptural handling in the musical ornament of the *recitar cantando*, which also sought to revive the arts of the ancients. Scholars note the rich patterning of the surface of the music in Monteverdi's early works, created by chromatic accents, passages of light and dark, the arrangement of dissonances to achieve textural powers of affect. Sung dialogues between shepherds in love on the passion of their longing already characterised the madrigal form; as this fused with the pastoral play, the roles of the lovers came to be sung by virtuoso individual voices rather than a group. The heart of these early operatic productions became the duet, in which two voices performed together, the musical composition simulating their desire. The two parts intertwined, pressing into dissonances that achingly resolved only to open up into new progressions of dissonant tension and resolution. Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne* and his *Pluto and Proserpina* mirror the performance of an operatic duet between lovers. These sculptural couples' forms similarly reach, cross, intertwine in the choreography of their limbs. Bernini's pronounced handling that left its virtuoso trace upon the marble surface formed a visual parallel to the singer's voice. The key characteristic of the operatic solo voice was the apostrophe, a musical suspension effected by holding the note. Listeners expected to be dazzled by its virtuosity, caught in a web of empyrean deferral, yet longing to hear motion. Above all, listeners were transformed into lovers themselves, hanging onto the singer's every pitch just as Bernini constructed his viewer as an Apollo reaching for his Daphne.⁸⁰ The singer's apostrophe, like the detail of Bernini's carving, was the virtuoso's mark.

These visual and aural means of suspension and deferral mirror the poet's theme. It was Apollo's mythic desire for Daphne that produced the language of poetry as that of love and longing. As she became the laurel, Apollo named this the crown of poetry to commemorate the object of his desire. The story of his loss, like Orpheus' of Euridice, emblematised poetic evocations of longing – for arcadias, youth, beauty and love. Like the solo voice celebrated for its individuality of effects, Bernini's searching technical execution and visible handling rendered *Apollo and Daphne* a virtuoso piece for its audience of *cognoscenti*. The piece embodied the paradox of a mimetic culture's most cherished trope – to lend embodied illusion to the simulacrum through a visible artifice so that the effigy is both art and illusion, a seeming presence of that which is absent, lost. This is echoed in the form of Scipione's art collection. The collector's pleasure is also tinged with loss, with the knowledge that his objects are fragments of worlds that can never fully be recovered, and that he can never fully possess. Yet the collector repeats his act of acquisition, like the lover, in the will to possess, and, like the repetitive detail of ornament, the singer's apostrophe, to defer the narrative, halt the march of time.

Material Illusions

Forty years after carving *Apollo and Daphne* Bernini travelled to Paris, where the French art collector and critic Paul Fréart de Chantelou kept a detailed record of the artist's commentary on his work as it progressed. This source and Bernini's biographies, which also record the artist's workshop maxims, constitute a body of material concerning Bernini's sculptural intentions. From them we can glean a theory of illusion that hinged on a defiance of the sculptor's medium. Bernini's comments are corroborated by the recent spate of technical evidence resulting from conservation work on these sculptures.⁸¹ In Bernini's hands dense inflexible marble became lithe and supple like paint. The measure of his virtuosity lay in the degree of this material illusion. Bernini carved the surface of his marble to forge relief, its projections catching the light to render highlights, its hollows, conversely, creating shadows. By orchestrating his carving according to its resulting pattern of lights and cast shadow, he seemed to 'paint' upon the marble, applying light and shade like the painter. In his own words: 'one must hollow out the marble, in this way obtaining the effect of colour and supplementing, so to speak, the art of sculpture, which cannot give colour to things'.⁸² Bernini purposefully engaged his art of stone in a productive rivalry with painting, seeking to emulate the effects of colouring in a colourless medium. It was also through the orchestrated play of light across the marble that he rendered the sculptural illusion of diverse tactile effects, traditionally seen as the preserve of painting, particularly those of softness and evanescence that Daphne's changing form embodies.⁸³

The structure of *paragone*, of productive comparison, stretched beyond the confines of its *cinquecento* legacy to encompass a larger sense of artistic rivalry, finessed by a nascent connoisseurship in this period. In *Apollo and Daphne*, Bernini's challenge to painting's supremacy in the sixteenth-century *paragone* debate through his ductile handling of marble may be said to converge onto his dialogue with Michelangelo's definition of the sculptor's brief. Michelangelo's famous conception of the sculptor's task as that of uncovering the form within the marble through the dexterous removal of extraneous stone forged a theory of sculptural form as contained within the confines of its original block. This same will to bear witness to the materiality of sculpture resulted in pieces with a uniform finish. While some of the early works are highly polished, and some unfinished, the surface of Michelangelo's sculpture is usually a uniform lightly smoothed stone that does not distract from the definition of form. If Bernini's earlier pieces may be construed as comments from within Michelangelo's conception of sculpture, the *Apollo and Daphne* breaks new ground, defining marble's painterly possibilities as the arena for his invention and skill. Michelangelo made an art of marble's materiality; Bernini's running Apollo instead disregards the confines of the block and Daphne metamorphoses marble into a gamut of textural illusions. With this reconception of the sculptor's art came the making of a technical revolution. In *Apollo and Daphne* Bernini began the work of sculptural virtuosity that would become his hallmark, using the stoneworker's tools to redefine the sculptor's lexicon, forging a sculptural language of stone as the acme of illusion. Michelangelo had defined the nature of his art as lying within the parameters of the marble block; Bernini instead deployed his art to use, and disguise, the joins between multiple pieces of marble as part of his technology of illusion, in order to extend the boundaries of sculpture beyond the block into expansive and complex figural poses previously considered the

preserve of painting. Similarly, in working the surface of his marbles he sought to challenge the limitations of his material by conjuring ‘painterly’ effects of softness out of stone.⁸⁴

Bernini’s considered dialogue with the art of the past surely grew out of the cultural interests of the patronage circle for which the *Apollo and Daphne* was made. With this piece he positioned sculpture as a rival to painting in its claim to represent the effects of poetic language. And like Renaissance painters he took up the challenge to rival nature in all its teeming profusion, to convey visual effects as varied as rough bark beside soft breast, the tangled lightness of hair, the dappled translucence of leaves. Conservators have noted that the skin of the marble, particularly of Daphne’s flesh, is coloured by a soft waxy patina tending to ivory shades. Many years later Bernini discussed the effects of such a patination, which he valorised as bringing a sculpture to perfection, lending it ‘a rare softness and a colour like that of flesh’, an effect of heightened lifelikeness that he calculated in his finish.⁸⁵ The poetic reception of his work returned constantly to his startling powers of imitation, which were perceived to rival not only painting but life itself, so that his figures seemed to move and speak: in Francucci’s words, ‘scultor loquace’. The plenitude of mimetic detail works cumulatively to heighten the illusion of presence. Scholars conventionally cite the passage in which Pluto’s firm grasp presses into Proserpina’s thigh to exemplify this, prompting the viewer’s bodily engagement with the work through the prism of tactile memory to figure an imagined imitation of Pluto’s touch (see fig. 51). The detail commands both a specular, embodied response and a study of its artistic means. Technical analyses emphasise Bernini’s endlessly varied ways of working the surface of his marbles; here a distinction in the type of wash used for Proserpina’s flesh in contrast to Pluto’s hand to differentiate between his coarser skin and the melting softness of chiaroscuro transitions in the rendering of hers.⁸⁶ At the same time the reference embodies the sculpture’s mimetic appropriation of antiquity: as Rudolf Preimesberger noted, it derives from a description of a lost work from Praxiteles’ circle in Pliny’s *Naturalis historia*, in which the hand of Pluto dimples the surface of Proserpina’s flesh.⁸⁷ The rivalry with antique sculpture manifest in Bernini’s citation of the *Apollo Belvedere* is equally intent. The reference was surely charged with the knowledge that the piece would enter a collection rich in antique sculptures, displayed side by side with their long history as the canon, the measure, of art.⁸⁸

Such comparison, or *paragone*, structured Scipione’s collection throughout, which brought together a mixed assembly of painting and sculpture, art and music, ancient and modern, artistic effigies and eloquent guests.⁸⁹ Villas and princely collections traditionally contained sculpture courts of antiquities; to this Scipione added his paintings and contemporary sculpture, intermingling them to create discursive juxtapositions between paint and stone, antique and contemporary. To return to Francucci’s poem, a continuous thread running through it is a comparison between two Scipiones: Africanus, the legendary Roman general celebrated by Petrarch; and Borghese. Many scholars have commented on the emphatic theme of *romanitas* that informed much of Scipione’s art collecting, exemplified in Bernini’s *Aeneas and Anchises*, the ancient story of Rome’s origins told by a modern sculptor. Francucci also drew attention to this – for example, coupling Federico Barocci’s depiction of Aeneas’ flight from Troy with a lost *Allegory of Rome Triumphant* by Cesare d’Arpino. The latter celebrated the urban developments of the Borghese papacy, which, like all pontificates, sought to recreate a new

Rome to rival that of the ancients. Certainly there was a rivalry of ancients and moderns at the villa, Scipione both emulating and vying with accounts of the great villas of antiquity, their famous banquets and lavish entertainments set within artistic *mises-en-scène*. The ancient/modern debate permeates the architectural ornament of the villa, with its extensive use of porphyry columns, urns, amphorae, mosaics, and the reliefs and busts on the façade, in visual dialogue with the seventeenth-century fabric of the building itself (see fig. 41).⁹⁰ Francucci's opening pages set out his poetic encounter with the collection as a contest between painting and sculpture, which Apollo was to judge. The poem suggests itself as both reflection and source for such games of eloquence on the collection's *paragoni* among Scipione's guests in tours of the gallery, akin to the social field that produced Maffeo's verses-cum-inscriptions.⁹¹

There was further dialogue between ancients and moderns in the very presentation and display of the villa's antiquities, for these were extensively restored by modern sculptors, including Bernini's father, Pietro, and, in the case of *Hermaphrodite*, the young Bernini. *Seicento* restoration of antiquities often entailed extensive additions, using the sculptor's imagination to endow a stone fragment with life. As Orietta Rossi Pinelli has shown, such work was understood as an opportunity for a display of inventiveness. On finding a piece whose iconography was impossible to name, it was common practice for patrons to ask that it be given accoutrements, costume and appropriate narrative gestures. When Nicolas Cordier was given a nameless torso by Scipione Borghese, his 'restoration' gave the piece an invented identity, that of a gypsy, or 'zingara'.⁹² Other examples from the Borghese collection further illustrate the point: the female nude that was to become the Borghese Venus with a shell was well preserved when discovered, yet the shell was added to give the figure a costumed identity. Such lavish acts of restoration gave otherwise unidentified fragments a character, a role to play within the compass of a gallery tour.

* * *

Giulio Mancini's *Considerazioni sulla pittura* written c.1620 during the years of Scipione's most active collecting and dedicated, most probably, to Maffeo Barberini, first circulated as a manuscript among *cognoscenti* friends of Maffeo's group. Addressing issues of the classification, acquisition and display of art, it has rightly been seen as launching a new genre of art criticism, written from the point of view of the collector rather than the practitioner of art. It surely drew on emergent connoisseurial methods, minted through verbal exchange in social visits to private collections such as Scipione's. That collectors in Scipione's circle of cardinalate patronage viewed their acquisitions through the comparative methods of the *paragone* is testified to in Mancini's manuscript, as also in the structure of Francucci's *cantata*. While Mancini's text may not be read as a reflection of, or a programme for, the type of exchange that took place before the objects in Scipione's villa, the circumstances of its chronology and patronage nevertheless suggest a proximity. For Mancini, judgement is formed in company with fellow connoisseurs, by looking at objects together to draw out their similarities and differences.⁹³ While he instructs his reader by classifying paintings by school, he does not advocate this approach in a hang, instead privileging 'things . . . for delight':⁹⁴ 'But I would not want placed together the same school and manner . . . I

would like them alternated with other manners. . . . Because in this way through their variety they will delight the more through comparison.’⁹⁵

If we read this passage in conjunction with the verse of Francucci and others pertaining to the Borghese collection, as well as that written in response to Bernini’s sculptures across his career, what emerges most forcefully is the two-fold nature of the collector/viewer’s delight. Insistently, textual sources construct a binary structure to the culture of viewing art for this period. On the one hand, these writers ‘enter into’ the illusion they view so that the inanimate effigy seems to ‘come to life’; on the other hand they delight in studying the technical means by which illusion is rendered. This horizon of anticipated response is borne out in Bernini’s handling of the marble surface: the working of the marble’s skin both serves the presence of the illusion in its alignment of kinaesthetic fictions and simultaneously calls the viewer to consider the artist’s presence in his signature marks, the visible signs of his manipulation of the sculptor’s tools across the surface of the stone.

This doubled delight in viewing art marks the structure of texts from the period and, I would argue, the conceit of the art itself. Recalling again the Farnese ceiling: among its ‘gallery’ of fictive paintings are also painted illusions of medals and inscriptions (see fig. 43). Much of the wit of the ceiling depends on the illusionistic playfulness of medium. In fact, we look upon a smooth-surfaced stuccoed ceiling but figuratively we view a display of paintings and coins as if they hung across the great vault of the gallery. We may imagine viewers at first stupefied by this marvellous theatre of illusion, then uncovering its means. It is a formal parallel to the journey of viewing solicited by *Hermaphrodite*, or by the teasing treatment of marble as wax in *Daphne* and *Proserpina*. Here, the illusion is of fresco that becomes metal coin, wood frame, canvas and stucco. Thus the subject of the ceiling is that of a fictive collection, born from the same rivalry between poetry and painting as Maffeo’s verses, Scipione’s collecting and Bernini’s artistry. This contrast of viewing modes is most often expressed in spatial terms of far and near, intersecting with a temporal distinction between the initial view ‘all at once’ and the gradual unfolding of detail, bit by bit, that the prolonged encounter can yield. Pietro da Cortona described this duality of viewing as constructed by the visual form of his Barberini ceiling (fig. 52), which was intended first to stun the viewer with its opulence of illusion and then to invite the viewer to ‘wander’ within each of its tapestry of episodes. Similarly, Poussin suggested that his work be regarded in two ways, which he termed ‘aspect’ and ‘prospect’, meaning that the viewer should ‘walk through” the landscape of a picture, encountering both the grand panorama and the myriad details that adorn it.’⁹⁶ These different accounts of both practitioners and connoisseurs see the viewing eye as mobile, first struck by the overall effect and then moving among its different parts in a closer study. Bernini’s mythological pieces for the Villa Borghese, likewise, seem to ‘call’ the viewer to an intimate view of close-up surfaces that dazzle both with the virtuosity of their illusionism and with the technical artistry of their means.

Narratives of Display

It has long been noted that Bernini's sculptures for the Villa Borghese respond to multiple viewing points in an art-historical discourse founded in Wölfflinian formalism. Although some scholars have argued for a single viewing point for *Apollo and Daphne* as exemplifying the pictorial qualities of Baroque sculpture, there is no consensus among them as to which is the dominant view.⁹⁷ In 1665 the artist himself commented to Chantelou on the importance of a multiplicity of viewing points in a story that ridiculed the concept of a single fixed position with displeasing views from every other place in the room.⁹⁸ The passage underscores Bernini's understanding of the issue in terms of the social space through which the sculptural object is apprehended. In light of this it is significant that the Stanza di Dafne has three entrances, two from within the villa and one from the garden (fig. 53). *Apollo and Daphne* is now placed in the centre of the room to allow global viewing. However, the earliest archival source we possess concerning its location, of 1625, illustrates the base as placed against a wall, necessarily restricting the viewing range to exclude that side along the wall.⁹⁹ The base was both extended and raised in an eighteenth-century refabrication; originally the figures stood closer to eye level to effect a more intimate rapport with the viewer.¹⁰⁰ Documentary evidence tells us that the *Apollo and Daphne* stood against the west wall of this room, so that the visitor would have seen it to the left on entering the room from within the villa, and across the room on entering from the garden.¹⁰¹ There has been much debate as to whether *Apollo and Daphne* stood lengthwise or breadth-wise against the wall.¹⁰² Archival sources reveal ongoing payments for the movement of sculptures about the villa, suggesting that they were frequently rearranged.¹⁰³ In light of this it is even possible that it may have been rotated from side to frontal views. Howsoever the *Apollo and Daphne* may have stood, the fact that there are three entrances means that, in practice, it was seen from multiple viewpoints via the different points of entry to this room. The passage from Chantelou's diary provides evidence that, at any rate by 1665, Bernini considered this significant. As Joy Kenseth has argued, the choreography of the sculpture is sympathetic to a synchronic succession of views. It presents Apollo giving chase; Daphne in flight; Daphne's metamorphosis (fig. 54). The walk around the sculpture from Apollo to Daphne may reasonably be construed as a narrative progression of viewing points.¹⁰⁴ Thus Bernini's form offers temporal succession in visual terms, but this unfolds only by means of the visitor's participatory movement around the piece. The sculpture's formal arrangement elicits movement of the viewing body, and so a changing and dynamic spectacle of reception. Viewer and sculpture are orchestrated into an ensemble, the performance of which transforms both: Daphne into bark, marble into flesh and flora, the viewer into a kind of Apollo embracing his laurels. Such metamorphosis is the very stuff of Marinisque *concettismo*, of marvel, of Borghese delight.

* * *

In 1650 the Borghese commissioned a guidebook to the Villa Borghese by Jacopo Manilli that remains our best source as to what manner of arrangement and display Scipione might have adopted for his collection. While the hang was surely modified from 1625 to 1650, if only to accommodate new acquisitions, Manilli's book nonetheless gives an idea of types of objects that might be brought together. In the Stanza di

Dafne the guidebook describes the sculpture in the company of a selection of antique heads as well as Bernini's *Aeneas and Anchises*, displayed along the walls of the room, with a collection of sixteenth-century paintings above, including Caravaggio's now lost *Boy Bitten by a Crab*. It also included the following: 'Above a walnut table in a pedestal style sits a frontispiece, also of walnut, with shutters in the middle. . . . These open by some unseen mechanism, and out jumps a terrifying monster's head, which screeches with a terrible voice.'¹⁰⁵ Thus, according to Manilli, this early modern automaton took its place alongside Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne*. John Evelyn's diary entry for November 1644 corroborates the presence of such objects in the villa's collection, describing a mechanical singing satyr, and a chair that 'catches fast' any who sit in it.¹⁰⁶ It was surely this type of juxtaposition that prompted Haskell to view Scipione's collecting as lacking intentionality.

If we turn again to poetic and performed conceits of the period, however, Marino's verse provides a key to Scipione's conjunction of Bernini's art and the automaton, bringing them into analytical view together. The abiding trope of Marino's *La galleria* was of works of art that came to life, that were able to rival and surpass nature's claims and to move, speak and breathe. The thrust of Marino's conceit may be found abundantly throughout the poetic literature on art from the period, which insistently theorised the nature of artistic illusion in terms of Pygmalion's metamorphosis – another tale from Ovid. Francucci's description of the Borghese Caravaggio's *David with the Head of Goliath* as a work of art come to life is representative of this genre. It culminates in a celebration of Caravaggio's mimetic skill: 'And now that [Goliath] is dead, he appears more lifelike yet,' a topos for the artist's skill in conveying the illusion of life in the inanimate.¹⁰⁷ Scipione's collecting brought together opposing terms of a conceit of marvellous lifelikeness in similar fashion. While Bernini's sculpture challenged the limits of its medium to render the illusion of movement in inanimate stone, the automaton nearby effected this kinetic transformation from inanimacy to motion, from silence into voice. In a mimetic culture of viewing, the automaton's motions and voice suggested the same possibility for the sculptures in the collection too, through a kinaesthetic doubling.¹⁰⁸ And both were understood to mirror the movements and speech of their viewers. The automaton 'acted' in response to the viewer's action of opening the shutters of its wooden case; and we may imagine the startled viewer concomitantly 'shrieking' in response to the shriek of the automaton. Similarly, if visitors brought sculptures to 'life', as in Francucci's account, we may understand this claim as the specular effect of a participatory viewing. Bernini's sculptures solicited this, orchestrating an unfolding narrative through the viewer's bodily motion around the piece. This oscillating dialectic was surely also present in the performance of pastoral plays and musical recitals on mythological themes, set among the classicising statuary of a villa collection, where players and sculptures intertwined. At the same time, this automaton's mimetic work differed from that of the aria, or the singing satyr. While the pastoral opera evoked a dream of antique revival, the shrieking automaton's effect momentarily ruptured the reverie of the bucolic genre to open up reference to the viewer's social world. Like comic relief within a play, this passing interruption worked to reverse the rhythm of a viewer's absorption, albeit temporarily, with an ambivalent humour that straddled the social and the fictive realms, poetry with farce.¹⁰⁹ The shrieking automaton's performance punctuated the viewing experience with its vivid simulacrum of Pygmalion's powers, only to fold the viewer's

attention back into the work of this ‘lifelike’ art again, like the role of virtuoso detail in slowing the unfolding of a sculptural or operatic narrative. Thus the ‘play’ of the collection ranged from the automata’s jokes to the juxtaposition of art and inscriptions and the ludic forms of art’s illusion, all structured to engage, delight and occasion wonder in the visitor.

Mechanical toys such as Scipione’s automata constituted an integral part of Renaissance princely collecting. Water-powered moving figures were central to garden decoration, particularly in grottoes, as at the Villa d’Este; smaller types of clockwork figures, often on mythological themes and wrought in precious materials, were traditional to the collections of the *Wunder-* and *Kunstkammern*, and for court pastimes (fig. 55).¹¹⁰ These pieces constitute the material traces of a culture of marvel and of laughter. In this constellation we see the Villa Borghese at the cusp between two different collecting epistemes: that of the cabinet of curiosities; and that of the art museum of a burgeoning ‘classical’ age. Its collection lay between these two better-known trajectories in the history of early modern European collecting. Yet it was not merely a repository of an older tradition and the genesis of another. Scipione’s collecting was formed in a culture of delight, whether in the metamorphic rendering of the young Bernini’s virtuosity, the limitless literary play of signs that the age-old story of Apollo and Daphne had by then engendered, the enthralled suspension of an aria, the magical transformations of Baroque scenographies, or the visual game of the collector in juxtaposing painting and sculpture, ancient with modern, inanimate sculpture with automata.

* * *

Theodor Adorno understood the ‘museal’ object as deathlike, and the collection as a mausoleum of things ripped from the folds of ‘lived experience’.¹¹¹ Yet other cultural critics have argued in response that the museum collection’s dialectical work simultaneously bestows immortality on the objects it houses.¹¹² Thus we may reconfigure Adorno’s ‘graveyard’ as a site of metamorphosis, in which paint and stone become art. If this culture of mimesis cast the artist as Pygmalion, ceaselessly working to evoke lifelikeness in his effigies by transforming matter into seeming flesh, the figure of the collector/viewer was that of a rapt Narcissus caught in a specular trap of the object’s lure. The title of Susan Stewart’s book *On Longing* (1984) encapsulates an analysis of collecting as driven by a mobile desire, shifting from one object to another, which is germane to an analysis of the Borghese court’s delight in the fluid signifier – the marvelling wonder of Baroque scenography’s scene changes, and the poet’s shifting theme of metamorphosis. Thus our historical knowledge of Scipione’s esurient acquisitions may be read as a metonymic quest to re-enter the antique past through material fragments. This finds a parallel in the work of the artist Bernini, searching for the sensible means to bring his effigies ‘to life’.¹¹³

Pastoral Arts

Artistic definitions of lifelikeness from the period, like Baldinucci’s 1681 explication of *vivacità*, understood the semblance of life to reside notably in the face. The physical

traces of breathing should be visible; the eyes alert and focused; the mouth open.¹¹⁴ Chronology suggests that such definitions followed well-established artistic practices. The depiction of the open mouth in Renaissance art appeared in rivalry with descriptions of this detail in antique sources. Pliny's store of information about ancient art in his *Naturalis historia* relates that Polygnotus of Thasos first introduced the rendering of an open mouth to endow his art with greater powers of expression; and in keeping with stories of birds that pecked paintings of grapes, he claimed that a work by Aristides depicting an open mouth 'seemed almost to speak'.¹¹⁵ Such anecdotes had a long echo across the early modern period, infusing the artist's work with a quest for the seeming appearance of life. Poussin would term the task of the painter as that of a singer making visible 'the force of the voice', so rendering a doubled illusion not only of the visual appearance of the speaking face but of the aural qualities of sound.¹¹⁶ In a 1990 study of Caravaggio's *The Lute Player* (fig. 56) Keith Christiansen notes that the musician's lips are parted like those of a singer to suggest that the youth accompanies himself on the lute; Christiansen cites Giovanni Camillo Maffei's musical treatise of 1582, *Discorso della voce*, as recommending the parted lips as proper musical form. Further, the musical score depicted in the *Lute Player* is of madrigals by the sixteenth-century composer Jacques Arcadelt on the recurrent theme of love's loss. Taking all this in conjunction with the youth's costume, Christiansen suggests that the *Lute Player* might represent the performance of a pastoral play. Painted for cardinalate circles in the late 1590s, these musical paintings had a patronage similar to Scipione's collecting; this group of patrons shared common musical interests, in instruments and in singers, who were maintained in their houses and performed for their guests.¹¹⁷

Among the automata in Scipione's art collection, while some shrieked and produced comic effects of surprise, there were more, like the singing satyr that Manilli described, that sang or made music, as other examples from the period illustrate (fig. 57). As the automated satyr sang, so the inscriptions on the bases of Bernini's figures seemed to 'speak' on their behalf. Both Proserpina and Daphne are rendered with open mouths, the hollow of their throats represented by a sculpted cavity. While the shape of Proserpina's mouth, coupled with her tears, suggests a lament, Daphne's mouth is rounded into an 'O' (figs 58 and 59). Proserpina's upturned eyes and the parting of her lips recall the face of *Laocoön*, just as her form echoes the *Niobids* (figs 60 and 61), Rome's most famous antique sculptures depicting the passions of grief and suffering; Bernini here played on his audience's cultural memory of these works to charge his *Proserpina* with greater tragic affect.¹¹⁸ In the case of *Apollo and Daphne*, we may note that Marino's poetic rendering of the story, *Dafne*, published in 1619, moves from a first-person account on the part of Apollo, vivid with verbs of momentum, to the descriptive stasis of Daphne's transformation, to conclude with a shift of enunciative voice to that of the poet.¹¹⁹ In the inscriptions on the pedestals of Bernini's marble 'poems', Proserpina 'calls' to the viewer in the first person while the voice of a poet-narrator speaks for Daphne, concluding the scene with a couplet, like an epilogue to Bernini's sculpted narrative. Both Apollo and Pluto are rendered with the slightly parted lips that, according to Chantelou, Bernini recommended as 'just before, or just after speaking'.¹²⁰ If Bernini chose to imitate and surpass the lifelikeness of Polygnotus' and Aristides' open mouths, he may also have sought to rival the startling presence of life rendered through Caravaggio's revolutionary style of painting, to evoke and surpass the painter's early renditions of singers with the technical *difficoltà*

of the sculpted mouth cavity. As Caravaggio's paintings numbered among Scipione's acquisitions, Bernini worked in the knowledge that his figures would stand comparison with the vivid naturalism of this great painter as well as the automata, the sculpted stones of antiquity, and Pliny's descriptions. The configuration of Apollo's and Daphne's dialogic mouths and intertwined forms may also evoke the *recitar cantando* of the pastoral duet. Daphne's mouth is in the form of *cantabile* – lyrical song – not the *terribile* of the shrieking automaton, which we also witness in Bernini's contemporary *Anima dannata* (fig. 62), or Proserpina's lament.¹²¹ For Bernini's audience of villa guests the performance of the pastoral madrigal constituted part of their cultural firmament, an 'intermediary form' that, like the allusion to classical sculpture, mediated and deepened their viewing of Bernini's illusion.¹²² Early modern musical treatises insistently relate that music might move the soul to love; if Daphne speaks *cantando*, like the poets, then the viewer is again, like Apollo, straining to capture that which can never be caught. At the same time the sculpture's inscription, which emerged from the actual 'voices' of its visitors, may be read as issuing from the viewer as poet, so drawing its audience into the milieu of the pastoral, the cultural space of Bernini's artistic illusion. Bernini solicits his viewer to regard his work both in terms of prospect and aspect; the Apolline view as well as that of the narrator and the connoisseur. The piece is polyphonic, the sequence of voices like a succession of frames in concert with the sequentialised bodily viewing it commands.

* * *

The visual unfolding of Bernini's story finds its parallel in the narrative strategy of Marino's *Dafne*, with its movement from Apollo's urgent pursuit to the attentive description of Daphne's transformation and finally to the voice of the poet. While the detail of the sculptural surface may interrupt the narrative's progression by calling the viewer into a close consideration of Bernini's means, yet it also serves the poetic rendering of Daphne's transformation. Looking back to the story of the cardinals' visit, it is by the loveliness of Daphne's finish that they are arrested, their contemplation of the narrative suspended in its web of surface pleasures. Daphne's metamorphosis itself takes the form of a *paragone* between art and nature, as she hovers between the forms of classical statuary and the painterly rendering of flesh. This art object of Borghese court culture came into being enmeshed in a poetic culture of pastoral and performance. Insistently its verse turned around the metaphor of illusion, drawing its audience into the realm of fiction. The artist sought to answer the challenge set by the poets' *paragoni* with art, poetry, music, theatre and above all life. This constellation of the arts cast the viewer as the object's mirror, summoned to enact its seeming motion and speech, *recitar cantando*. In Bernini's rendering, performed poetry became sculptural form.

Fountain and Festival

Among the material remains of Bernini's working thoughts for his *Fountain of the Four Rivers* is a model of wood, slate, and clay mixed with gesso, marked by traces of blue-coloured tints and gilding (fig. 63).¹ Together with a cluster of drawings, it bears witness to Bernini's preparatory process for this work.² The papal commission for the piece stipulated that the fountain be surmounted by an ancient obelisk; in Bernini's design this stands over a massive, rough-hewn, cleft rock, ornamented by four colossal reclining river gods (fig. 64).³ The model, however, stands at only 195 centimetres, 142 of which consist of the miniature obelisk. The base is 53 centimetres while the four river gods measure a diminutive 20 centimetres each. Thus the fountain's practical genesis unfolded through the proportions of decorative art.



The play of scale between the miniature model and the monumental fountain provides a key to situating Bernini's design for the *Four Rivers* within broader cultural histories. Conjoined to this material bifurcation of scale is a related series of counterpoints, rooted in the historical circumstances of the fountain's making. At its core, the fountain's form arose from a straddling of public and private realms, a process emblematised in the diametrics of scale out of which it was conceived. The fountain was destined for a public place – Piazza Navona – yet its design took shape within the privatised space of a palace interior in the dimensions of decorative art. Its destination was public; its patronage was princely, for it was commissioned by the Pamphili pope, Innocent X. Originating in a miniature model, viewed as a table-top ornament by the pope and his intimates, it would become the chief monument of a vast piazza.

Thus the fountain's genesis lay within an ongoing historical redefinition of public and private space in the early modern city that also encompassed distinctions between popular and princely realms. I will argue that the fountain's formulation drew on a contingent sphere of visual culture, shaped by similar bifurcations. This was festival art, those great if ephemeral scenographies built for the major festive occasions of the early modern ritual and diplomatic calendar (see fig. ●●). Like the fountain, festival art was situated between the public and the private realms. Mounted by princes in public streets and squares, festival scenography was itself a form of decorative art for the urban sphere.⁴ Rome's early modern festivals were great ceremonial events designed as composite entertainments, and, like the fountain, made to lend lustre to their patron's name. As many scholars have contended, the early modern European festival was a mirror of the prince, reflecting his magnificence in ludic form. The *Four Rivers* fountain also was conceived both to represent and to augment its patron's fame in the decorative form of art. In terms of patronage structures, the festival was a 'gift' from the prince to his subjects. Yet it also served as a courtly instrument of sovereignty

in bringing together the city and its citizens in the name of the prince as a metaphor for the 'body politic'. Staged in the public spaces of the city, through the medium of ephemeral scenographies, the festival reconfigured civic space with its temporary constructions or 'sets' for the celebration of princely births, deaths, marriages, coronations, diplomatic entries and military and political triumphs. In this way the private rites of the princely person were made into public events, just as the festival artist remade public space in the image of the patron. The fountain held together this same paradox of public and private interests, being both the pope's gift to his fellow citizens and a means by which to redesignate communal space in the image of his sovereignty.

Like the fountain, festival art quintessentially turned on a play of scale. Its constructed *apparati*, built in city squares, took the form of miniature cityscapes of buildings or monuments, decorated with architectural ornament in diminutive size. Conversely, decorative motifs such as mythical or fantastic creatures might be blown up to gigantic proportions for processional floats or other set pieces within larger festive performances. These unexpected scalings were among the marvels of the festival, a playful rendering of the patron's power to amplify and to reduce, to remake the world in his name.

If the formulation of the fountain, like the festival, arose between the private and the public, its subsequent history followed similar lines. Although the fountain's genesis and official reception lay within the realm of papal patronage, it generated a rich history of popular response that wilfully 'misread' the monument even as it was being built. Thus onto the contextual framework of public and private space I will also map an overlapping, but not synonymous, grid of high and low cultures. Within a series of seventeenth-century readings of the fountain, its figures were reinvented, indeed radically relocated, in terms of their signifying fields. If a palace culture produced in the fountain a permanent festival set, the popular response in the public space of the piazza was to appropriate the figures to another realm of early modern performance culture instead. Reception in the square alternatively linked the figures of the *Four Rivers* to the comic popular masks of improvised street theatre traditions. Thus in an 'histoire croisée'⁵ of high and low cultures, princely and popular, private and public, the fountain produced two 'theatres' of response within the square: that of a court culture out of which it was fabricated and into which it was officially received; and the pithy satirical protest of the popular comic mask. This chapter takes up the threads of both narratives, reading them simultaneously across the fountain's form. These two contrasting readings are underpinned by a vexed social and economic history of public and private interests played out in the space of the city. Yet the modes of reading, the cultural constructs deployed to give the fountain meaning, were the same. Both interpreted the fountain – indeed, enacted their differing responses – through a shared paradigm, a common culture of performance.

Model and Monument

Let us return to our model, known by its provenance as Giocondi-Forti, to situate it within a fuller narrative of Bernini's preparatory work for the *Four Rivers* fountain.⁶ This model is almost universally accepted as an autograph piece of unbroken

provenance, which remained in Bernini's studio at his death. It is generally dated between 1647 and 1649, as the first of a series of *modelli* for the fountain. Another model, preserved in Bologna's art academy, is usually viewed as a later version of Bernini's evolving thoughts, close to the final design for the fountain and possibly the model given to the carvers for execution, therefore dating from late 1649 to early 1650 (fig. 65).⁷ In addition, there are three further known *modelli* of individual figures relating to the *Fountain of the Four Rivers*: a terracotta lion, considered autograph and preserved over the centuries in Rome's Accademia Nazionale di San Luca (fig. 66), of which Bernini was once principal; and two terracotta models of river gods, generally though not unanimously attributed to the workshop, and now in Venice. All are of table-top dimensions.⁸ It is generally accepted that the Bologna model may have been given to assistants and collaborators as a template from which to scale up to the monumental proportions of the fountain itself. The Venice models are assumed to have been executed in order to be passed on to the sculptors appointed to carve the river gods. The functions ascribed to the Giocondi-Forti model have been more varied: it surely represents a stage in Bernini's unfolding thoughts for the fountain, to be read in conjunction with the remaining preparatory drawings, as many scholars have argued. But from its earliest publication by Stanislaw Frascchetti in 1900 it has also been suggested that Bernini used it as a presentation model in order to secure the commission for the fountain.⁹

As is well known, the Pamphili pope Innocent did not initially invite Bernini to compete for this commission, calling instead on other artists so as to distance himself from the cultural politics and artistic favourite of his reviled predecessor, Urban VIII. This was the difficult moment of Bernini's fall from papal grace, following the development of cracks in his dome of St Peter's and the death of his great patron, Urban VIII, which left him free to take up the commission of the Cornaro chapel. The *Fountain of the Four Rivers* was the means by which Bernini regained papal favour. His biographer Filippo Baldinucci relates how the artist secured the commission:

Prince Niccolò Ludovisi . . . prevailed on [Bernini] to make a model of the fountain. . . . And the Prince arranged for it to be transported to Palazzo Pamphili in Piazza Navona. There it was secretly placed in a room through which the Pope . . . had to pass. . . . Upon seeing such a noble creation and a design for such a vast monument he was ecstatic. . . . after spending a half hour or more with the model, continuously admiring and praising it . . . , he burst out with the following words: 'This is a trick of Prince Ludovisi, but it will be necessary to make use of Bernini despite those who do not wish it, since those who do not want his works should not look at them.' He immediately sent for Bernini.¹⁰

Bernini's son, Domenico, recounts the story more expansively, insisting on Bernini's ignorance of Ludovisi's plan.¹¹ However an undated letter from the Duke of Mantua's agent in Rome, Francesco Mantovani, also relates the incident, adding a secondary anecdote concerning the pope's sister-in-law, who was also Ludovisi's mother-in-law, Donna Olimpia:

The Cavalier Bernini has made a most beautiful model for the fountain to be built in Piazza Navona, a fiction of the four greatest rivers of the world that form a tall *macchina*, and above this the obelisk intended for the fountain will be placed, which needs a sublime pedestal because it is comparatively short and small, and without

this would have little effect in such a large and magnificent square. This design touched the Pope's heart, and declaring himself little satisfied with Borromini . . . it is believed that he will use Bernini in the future. Others ascribe the Pope's affection for Bernini to a more subtle stratagem, for . . . knowing Donna Olimpia's inclinations, [Bernini is said to have] made the model of the aforesaid fountain in silver with rare and marvellous artifice, and then given it to Her Excellency who, delighted by the material as much as the form, and the judgement, commended him to Innocent in such a way that Borromini fell to cede his place [to Bernini].¹²

Furthermore, an anonymous source among manuscript papers pertaining to Baldinucci suggests: 'Bernini did not win the Fountain in Piazza Navona because his model was more beautiful than the others but because it was worth more than the others. . . . The others made theirs of clay or of wax, and he made his of silver and in giving it to Donna Olimpia he gained the work . . . from which one sees that he was a greater courtier than sculptor and architect.'¹³

My interest here is not in the machinations that brought Bernini's design to the pope's attention but in the varied descriptions of the presentation model that won the commission, and their possible relationship to the Giocondi-Forti model. Frascchetti thought this the model for the silver presentation piece described in the sources; others have assumed they were one and the same; still others have argued that the silver presentation model preceded the Giocondi-Forti model, and that the story Mantovani relates was merely hearsay.¹⁴ Whatever the case, it is clear that the model was an object of decorative art in addition to being a preparatory work. This is evidenced in its proliferation, and the materials of which the various versions were made. Beyond those already referred to, there are other extant models of the fountain made of precious metals (fig. 67), and textual descriptions of yet further examples. Many of them evidently circulated as princely gifts within international circles, presented by members of the papal court to the crown heads of Europe – Louis XIV and Philip VI of Spain.¹⁵

This diffusion of miniature versions of the fountain, made in semi-precious metals, circulated within a princely gift economy, in which exquisitely worked renditions in luxury materials were highly valued.¹⁶ They testify to the fame of the fountain as well as constituting one of the means by which its reputation was made. In a similar vein, the Pamphili had commemorative medals struck in gold, silver and bronze that reproduced and multiplied its image as gifts within social and patronage networks.¹⁷ Thus the fountain's point of inception – the planted model that Innocent found – as well as the diffusion of its reception by means of decorative/commemorative copies, was manifest in diminutive versions of its monumental form. These were viewed and surely also, by virtue of their size, held and touched by princes and prelates within the privatised space of the palace. The *Fountain of the Four Rivers*' form took shape within the decorative arts of an international court culture. Yet its material production and monumental proportions would unfold in the civic and public realm, the ancient communal space of a Roman neighbourhood.

The Scenographic Square

Scholars of Bernini's *Fountain of the Four Rivers* have rightly understood its iconography in terms of dominion over time and place. The obelisk and river gods signify antiquity, the river gods also representing the four corners of the earth. Moreover, the obelisk recalls both the lore of ancient Egypt and its history intertwined with ancient Rome. Similarly the river gods, endowed variously with attributes of Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas, referenced not only different parts of the world but also those ancient Roman statuary traditions from which their identity as personifications of rivers came. Hence the *Four Rivers* fountain has consistently been read as a visual legitimization of papal dominance over geography and history – the various global regions and the ancient civilisations.¹⁸ At the same time, interpretations have turned on a close reading of the local space in which the fountain stands: Piazza Navona. Originally a stadium built by the Emperor Domitian, it was believed in the seventeenth century to have been a Roman circus marked out with obelisks down its centre. Thus the physical space itself, its ancient perimeter delineated by the surrounding development of buildings, was understood as a conjoining of past and present that the placing of the Pamphili obelisk would affirm.

Yet the *Four Rivers* fountain elicited a plethora of varied, at times even contradictory, readings throughout its construction and after its completion. To bring their plurality back into view requires an analysis through which we may reintegrate the fountain's richly bifurcated history of reception. It is therefore useful to construct the analysis as a series of intertwined levels of signification, moving between the fountain's *premiers signifiés* and a broader enquiry that encompasses the cultural purchase of its forms and motifs.

The name of Athanasius Kircher, the great Jesuit scholar of an emerging Egyptology, is often linked to the fountain's iconography.¹⁹ Innocent instructed Kircher to direct the excavation and subsequent restoration of the broken obelisk intended for the *Four Rivers*, a restoration executed by Bernini's brother Luigi and his studio apprentice Antonio Canini. The links were surely tight. Moreover the pope commissioned Kircher to author several treatises on hieroglyphs, among them a text on the obelisk for the fountain, *Obeliscus Pamphilius*. Appearing in 1650 in a lavish and finely illustrated edition (fig. 68), the book was produced as a festival publication to mark this jubilee year, underscoring the fountain's role in urban festive celebrations. Given a renewed vigour by the post-Tridentine church, jubilees brought great influxes of pilgrim-tourists to the papal city. As scholars of early modern Rome's urban development have often pointed out, popes seeking to make their mark commissioned extensive building works in the run up to a jubilee to excite the admiration of visitors to the city. Although the *Fountain of the Four Rivers* was not, in fact, completed until the following year, Kircher's souvenir publication gave it a commemorative presence for the 1650 jubilee. Kircher traced a general history of Egyptian worship, noting that the ancient Egyptian cult of the obelisk centred on the belief that its ray-like form could capture the animating, vivifying powers of the sun. Briefly put, and in keeping with the broader historiographical project of a post-Tridentine church that emphasised continuities with the past, Kircher understood ancient religions, including that of Egypt, as precursors of a Catholic Christianity. In general terms his text suggested the power of obelisks to transmit a divine light to the four corners of the earth. We may see its

mark in Bernini's conceit of the river gods as the four continents, surmounted by the Pamphili obelisk.

Scholars have also suggested Michelangelo Lualdi, canon and theologian, as an advisor for the *Four Rivers*. Lualdi wrote a poem in celebration of the fountain, published in 1651, and authored several texts concerned with Catholic evangelism around the world, notably his *La propagatione del Vangelo nell'Occidente*, 1651, which describes the fountain; and his *L'India orientale sogettata al Vangelo* of 1653.²⁰ Further, Mary Christian and Cesare D'Onofrio have connected the *Four Rivers* to broader concerns of a post-Tridentine church, following the humiliating Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, which sealed the loss to the Catholic fold of much of northern Europe.²¹ Thus the obelisk as a sun sign may be read as a representation of the reach of the Catholic church around the world through its missions, here figured by Bernini's river gods with their varying attributes. In this regard it is significant that Borromini's competing design for the commission also conceived of the fountain's flow as the confluence of the four major rivers of the world (fig. 69). In line with the evangelising purpose of the seventeenth-century Catholic church, intent on recouping its losses in Europe with missions across the world, the *Four Rivers* embodied the culture of *propaganda fide* in its papal heartland, Rome. Thus the fountain's iconographic specifics took form within a multiplicity of cultural imperatives. Pamphili family ambitions to mark the city with a lasting memorial in their name also played a central role.

Looking at the social geography of early modern Rome, the remaking of Piazza Navona by the Pamphili may be seen as part of a broader urban process. It is a commonplace of Baroque urbanism to argue for a historic shift in which the square became a fundamental unit of the city's development, following on, and in tandem with, Renaissance quests to widen and regularise the streets and roads that made up the city's arteries.²² Throughout the Middle Ages, Piazza Navona had remained an earthen space, studded with the antique remains of Domitian's stadium; it contained a water trough for laundry and for watering cattle and horses, and a daily food market had taken place there since 1477 (figs 70 and 71). Thus its workaday appearance into the first half of the seventeenth century was predicated on the wherewithal of a large market. Innocent's reign marked the historical moment at which the square was remade: its surface paved, its perimeter regularised, the debris of ancient ruins cleared. Renovation produced an unbroken line of buildings along the rim of the square, lending a new clarity to its perimeter. This redefinition of the square accompanied papal expansion of the Pamphili family palace, flanking the south-west side of the piazza, to include the existing small church of Sant'Agnese within its fabric.²³ Innocent commissioned the *Four Rivers* to ornament the square's centre. On its completion he banned the daily food market, proclaiming the square instead a 'place of beauty'.²⁴ Thus the fountain was key to the transmutation of this part of the city's urban fabric in the image of Rome's temporal as well as spiritual lord. Early modern papal families transformed Rome's squares into scenographic urban spaces, permanent stage sets for the city's ceremonial and festival display.²⁵ This is manifest in the deployment of Bernini, the consummate papal artist, as civic artist too.

When the d'Este agent in Rome wrote to Modena with news of the papal court in December 1651, he described Piazza Navona as 'worthy of a great prince . . . now kept like a theatre [*teatro*]'.²⁶ We recall that the Duke of Mantua's agent, Mantovani, referred to the fountain as a 'macchina'. The choice of terms to describe the fountain

and its transformation of this urban space is signal. These similes were commonly used to denote the decoration of spaces for festival and ceremonial display, which were distinguished from quotidian urbanism by their ornament.²⁷ In terming the piazza a 'teatro' the d'Este agent conjoined the square's permanent redevelopment with the ephemeral 'theatres' of festival decoration, drawing them together as proximate realms. If architectural historians recognise the disposition of festival *apparati* in the regularised rim of the piazza, and in the language of its architectural ornament, Bernini's fountain complemented and extended the metaphor, furnishing the square with a centrepiece in the image of a festival *macchina*.²⁸ Henri Lefebvre's analysis of the social production of space suggests an understanding of Piazza Navona's early modern urban development as the transformation of an ancient civic space into a scenographic representation of papal power. Deploying the visual languages of the princely festival, urbanism drew on this lexicon of ephemeral forms in order to remake urban space in the image of the sovereign. Using Lefebvre's terms, we may understand the historical production of the square as a material representation of the ideologies of early modern papal absolutism. This is also manifest in the parallel transformation of civic ritual and festival from a communal to a princely spectacle, with a visual syntax and vocabulary of triumph and amplification able to articulate the politics of early modern absolutist power. The thesis rests on Warburg's conceptualisation of ritual, festival and theatrical performance as 'intermediary forms', stylised representations of lived experience, from which works of art might draw their force.²⁹ This may be viewed as a process of translation from ritual action into art, heightened by medial exchanges between ephemeral decoration and permanent works of architecture, sculpture and painting. Early modern Rome's urban development, epitomised in Piazza Navona, thus embodied in perpetuity the ritual histories out of which it grew.

Fountains and Festivals

To mark the accession of Innocent X Pamphili to the papal throne in 1644 a series of linked decorations were constructed along the route of his inaugural cavalcade, the *via papale*, and in various squares of the city.³⁰ As has often been remarked, the ephemeral festival decorations for Innocent's inauguration displayed an iconography similar to that which would later be deployed for the *Four Rivers*. The motifs are, in fact, too general to be construed as 'sources', but the context of the festival is significant. These same motifs recurred in the evening celebrations marking the papal accession, above all in the form of fireworks, those early modern set pieces of visual display that illuminated an urban space for several hours.³¹ Fireworks were usually of allegorical intent and often comprised some degree of narrative, strewn with antique references like the decorations that also marked the route of papal progress. Extant prints and *relazioni* for 1644 describe a succession of firework scenes staged in Rome's great squares. These included a display in Piazza Spagna in the form of an allegory of Rome Triumphant with personifications of the four continents – Europe, Asia, Africa, America – which have been linked to Bernini's conceit for the four river gods (fig. 72).³² In Piazza Navona a rock formation representing Mount Ararat was surmounted by Noah's ark, to which a dove, recalling the Pamphili crest, flew at the close of the display (fig. 73). Piazza Spagna hosted another, more elaborate, rock formation with

caverns from which issued forth other animals associated with Pamphili heraldry. These rock formations have commonly been identified as a source for Bernini's conception of the fountain's rock base (fig. 74). Other scholars have seen in the fountain's cleft base the form of an arch, linking it to the ephemeral arches of the new pope's triumphal possession of the city by the progress of his cavalcade across it, and, by association, to the Roman arches of antiquity. Frank Fehrenbach specifically ties the *Four Rivers* to the quadripartite Arch of Janus in the Forum Boarium, long interpreted as a representation of Rome's rule over all four parts of the world, matched by the four 'arches' of Bernini's cleft rock. Finally, amid other arguments of a text-image kind, Fehrenbach understands the composition of the fountain's base as a whole to resemble the form of a revolving festival carousel, those ceremonial equestrian displays that turned around a centre point.³³

It is a staple of Bernini scholarship to analyse many of his major monuments as permanent forms of ephemeral decorative traditions, as with the *Baldachin*, and the *Cathedra Petri* addressed in Chapter 2. In his work on the early modern festival in Rome, Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco has traced Bernini's deep involvement with festival decoration, listing at least thirty engagements from the 1620s to the 1650s. These works included the *apparati* for *Quarant'ore* decorations in church displays, discussed in Chapter 2, as well as princely funeral cortèges, papal-sponsored diplomatic celebrations for royal births of the French and Spanish crowns, and entrance ceremonies for visiting sovereigns, notably those for Queen Christina of Sweden in 1655.³⁴ Thus the visual languages and workshop practices of the occasional arts were familiar to Bernini across his career.

Equally, architectural historians for the early modern period have noted how extensively the language of architectural ornament drew on the memory of festival decoration. Manfredo Tafuri has traced the iteration of festival forms in Italian palace architecture of the period, with a decorative vocabulary structured by the recollection of the temporary balconies, hangings and swags erected for festive celebrations.³⁵ More specifically, scholars of Bernini's architecture have argued that both his monumental projects, such as the colonnade for St Peter's, and his interior decorations, like the redressing of Santa Maria del Popolo, borrow from his work on festival decorations.³⁶ Conversely the historian of early modern Italian theatre Ludovico Zorzi has uncovered a shared visual language between early modern urbanism and theatre stage sets, which were largely perspectival renderings of cityscapes.³⁷ In doing so he, like Tafuri, pointed to the role of festival decoration as an intermediary form between art and the everyday. An early modern court culture's ceaseless quest for surprise and novelty in its festive forms made the festival artist's workshop, in Giuliano Briganti's phrase, into a 'technical laboratory' for Baroque visual experiments. In his study of Pietro (Berrettini) da Cortona, Briganti analysed the artist's moves between architecture and decoration to find similarities in technique from one realm to the other, noting also the degree of shared materials between ephemeral products and preparatory works for permanent art. More broadly, Briganti understood the relationship between urban development and the work of the festival as formative, seeing in the ephemeral this culture's modal means, a connecting tissue between its various visual manifestations.³⁸ Maria Antonietta Visceglia has defined early modern Rome as a 'ritual city', suggesting that its material fabrication was constructed around processional routes and inflected by this ceremonial practice. Lewis Mumford's classic study of the

city, too, recognised Baroque urbanism as a translation of ritual practice into built form.³⁹

The space of the festival has been described by André Chastel as a ‘*lieu imaginaire*’, able to transform buildings, quotidian city streets and squares into imagined realms of myth, fable and distant times and places by means of its art.⁴⁰ Over the early modern period the civic festival’s social *imaginaire* was increasingly that of the court. As Visceglia and Martine Boiteux, among others, have argued, Italian festival forms across the *longue durée* of historical change evolved from a medieval image of *communitas* into their orchestration as idealised projections of court culture. Thus, like court entertainments, the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century urban festival was increasingly classicising in its references, studded with mythological figures and other decorative symbols of antique derivation.⁴¹ Again, Lewis Mumford noted that the urban planners deployed by early modern rulers were also their court scenographers, as in the case of Bernini, who staged not only the *intermezzi* of palace entertainments but also the festivals that unfolded in city streets. The convergence of forms between stage set, festival *apparati* and urbanism was not limited to the realm of materials and technique but included also the deployment of common representational motifs. Chastel’s ‘*lieux des fêtes*’ were in fact those of the everyday city but transfigured *all’antica*. As Frances Yates has argued, this fictive realm of the antique *urbs* was superimposed on the built, social spaces of the city’s early modern architectural fabric. In the case of Rome, and notably at Piazza Navona, the fusion between archaeological traces and ephemeral decorations in the form of classical motifs made of the city a kind of ‘memory theatre’, marked by what Pierre Nora termed ‘*lieux de mémoire*’.⁴² The motif of the obelisk as a festival decoration stood at this meeting point of ancient and modern, enduring and ephemeral, in both monumental and miniature forms. It appeared regularly as ornament on early modern catafalques and on festival cars, and as the base for firework displays that shot into the sky, like those staged in Piazza Navona in 1650. And as the opening of this chapter outlined, in tracing the circulation of miniature forms of the *Fountain of the Four Rivers* as courtly gifts, the obelisk was also disseminated in the realm of decorative objects of semi-precious metals of silver and gilt bronze. The appearance of the obelisk within Chastel’s festive *lieu imaginaire* was prefigured in the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* of 1499, in which Egyptian motifs appeared in dream-like configurations of antiquities in its illustrations and as described in the text. The court cultures of early modern Europe, with their attendant literary production, formed ready channels for a transfusion of *all’antica* motifs between the decorative and the ephemeral arts.

Of all the classical motifs deployed in festival decorations, the most frequent was the Roman triumphal arch, its ephemeral manifestations echoing those permanent antique arches of the city’s history-marked topography. Festive arches were deployed with ubiquity for ceremonies of procession through the city – for the welcome of foreign princes and dignitaries, and for the new pope’s cavalcade across Rome, the *posse*. This conjoining of triumph with festival was a historic development forged by the early modern papacy that would emanate across the courts of Europe. The transformation of the *posse* into a triumph *all’antica* crystallises this broader trajectory. Whereas its medieval antecedents represented this journey as a liminal, Bakhtinian inversion that anthropologists would recognise as one of reversal, the early modern ritual became a triumphal entry that reified the power of the papacy through an apotheosis of the new incumbent. The post-Tridentine church’s emphasis on representations

of triumph as a metaphor for its dominion co-opted the symbols of a Renaissance *romanitas*, founded in the city's historic remains. These vestiges of triumph in turn directed the references of festival ornament towards the classical past.⁴³

Thus the 1644 firework display in Piazza Spagna of Rome Triumphant attended by personifications of the four continents may be connected to Bernini's four river gods in a further sense. While the fireworks present an allegory of triumph, and the fountain the form of a triumphal arch, they share a common origin in the expression of triumphant princely power – that of the Catholic church and its pontiffs. Following historians of early modern ritual, I am arguing that the seventeenth-century Roman festival, staged in the city's streets and squares and viewed by all comers, deployed the language of antiquity as a sign of its princely authority. If the *lieu de la fête* was the public street, yet the festival's visual language was that of the palace. Bernini's fountain in a city piazza, in drawing on ephemeral festival productions for its forms and motifs, was a fabrication of court art. The stories of its point of origin as a model placed in a palace *salone* to capture the pope's eye, or as a silver model given to Donna Olimpia as a courtly gift in return for patronage, are testament to this derivation.

* * *

Bernini's *Four Rivers* fountain gave permanent form to the festival's 'theatre', reconfiguring Piazza Navona as a stage for papal ceremonial display in perpetuity. To do so it drew on earlier festival transformations of this great space. Three festive *teatri*, in particular, delineate the main stages of this historical process: the entry of the Prince of Poland to Rome in 1634; Innocent's papal inauguration in 1644, discussed above; and the ritual procession of Christ's Resurrection at Easter in the Jubilee year of 1650. These are highpoints in which we may recognise most clearly the longer, imperceptibly gradual reiterative work of ritual in redefining collective space.

In 1634 Cardinal Antonio Barberini staged a magnificent celebration in Piazza Navona to honour the entry of the Prince of Poland to Rome during Carnival, which was to be the model for the princely Baroque spectacle for centuries to come. It marked the acme of a longer history, initiated by the institution of the national Spanish confraternity in Rome at the church of San Giacomo degli Spagnoli on the east side of the square in 1579, which brought the rituals of the Spanish ruling house to Piazza Navona. These commemorations of the life rites of a royal family, at once private and popular, epitomise the crux of the early modern princely festival held in the public domain.⁴⁴ Such festive transformation of the space of the square reached new heights under the Barberini. The point of departure in 1634 was the celebration of the great Spanish victory of 1492, when the 'infidel Saracens' were expelled from Granada. The battle was commemorated annually in Piazza Navona because of the square's strong Spanish connections; 1634, however, brought this to unparalleled levels of lavish princely display. The main event was a staged joust between Spaniards and 'Saracens', initiated by a procession of liveries and coats of arms on horseback. The festivities typically combined the chivalric traditions of Europe's medieval courtly legacy in the rich colours of heraldry, yet studded with classicising mythological references, and with pastoral performances staged in princely materials of silk, silver and gold. As night fell a great boat circumnavigated the stage, commanded by Bacchus, with sails of taffeta and silver, and a column topped by a golden crown. Then an orchestra began

to play and the piazza echoed with the sound of angelic singing voices, a concert delightfully interrupted by a pastoral ballet of dancing shepherds, nymphs and satyrs, making sweet music by the light of thousands of torches. Official reports and diaries described the layout of the piazza for this princely occasion, and they are reinforced for us by paintings and prints of the spectacle (fig. 75). Raised seating made the centre of the piazza into a *teatro*, with designated spaces for audience and stage. On three sides of the square, seating was inset from the buildings, so creating a space behind for waiting coaches, coachmen and other attending servants. On the fourth side the loggias and balconies of the palaces constituted further, privatised viewing spaces for invited guests. Throughout the piazza, palace windows were festooned with draped cloth of the combatants' colours. To the 'theatre' itself there were two entrances. Within were separate seating areas for nobles and for women. Official accounts focused as much on the glittering audience as on the spectacle itself, for the splendid dress, jewels and gold were, in the words of one author, Ludovico Bentivoglio, the principal ornament of the festival, and many writers named the audience individually, as well as the liveries and coats of arms worn in the procession, to indicate the social standing of the occasion.⁴⁵ It is instructive to compare prints of this festival with a wood-cut illustration of Piazza Navona in Pompilio Totti's 1622 guidebook to Rome, *Ritratto di Roma moderna*, or a painting attributed to Johann Wilhelm Baur of the piazza in use as a market square dated to 1630 (see figs. 70 and 71). In its remaking of the square's quotidian and functional uses into one of scenography, the festival of 1634 may be said to have presaged, even constructed, the square's forthcoming renovation as a permanent space of princely papal display.

In 1650 the Pamphili revived another ritual procession traditionally associated with the Spanish confraternity in Piazza Navona, on the day of Christ's Resurrection at Eastertime. Previous popes had curbed, at times even suspended, these nationalist celebrations because they inflamed Spanish–French party politics within both court and city; but they were revived by the Pamphili for the jubilee of 1650 as a complement to the unfolding work of the fountain. The diarist Giacinto Gigli described the scene within the square's *teatro*, picked out by decorated wooden arches:

The company of the Resurrection made solemn procession . . . carrying the Holy Sacraments . . . together with an image of the Madonna, well and richly adorned. . . . Piazza Navona was decorated [for the occasion], as used to be done, and more so. The two fountains [at either end] of the piazza were enclosed within four walls with very high columns, and above the arches were towers and cupolas that seemed as if made of stone and coloured marble. Hidden within these were stands from which musical choirs sang during the procession. In the middle of the piazza where the obelisk now stands, which was not at the time yet finished, stood a great wooden fence covered with paintings . . . and in a straight line from the obelisk, running along the middle of the piazza, stood other painted obelisks filled with fireworks. The theatre of the piazza was surrounded by arches of painted wood, all filled with lamps, as were all the towers and other ornaments. In front of the obelisk, where the Church of Sant' Agnese now stands, was made a beautiful altar, with columns and a cornice above, painted and gilded, upon which the Holy Sacraments were placed.⁴⁶

Dominique Barrière's engraving of this festival (fig. 76) shows a figure of the risen Christ under a wooden baldachin or quadripartite arch, ornamented by miniature obelisks, and behind this the castellated structure surrounding the Pamphili obelisk, from which choirs sang to accompany the procession. A line of obelisks marked the centre line of the piazza in recollection of its perceived ancient status as a circus. In ephemeral, ritual form, painted wooden obelisks-cum-fireworks mirrored the obelisk on the emerging fountain, soon to transform the piazza into an enduring festival *teatro*, a permanent conjoining of art and 'theatre'.

Figured Wonder

The *Fountain of the Four Rivers* engendered a quantity of encomiastic poetry, a reception virtually unrivalled for the period.⁴⁷ This poetry, much of it recited in Rome's many literary academies, turned around topoi of stupefaction and delight. The fountain's marvellous engineering and artistry were understood to manifest Pamphili papal splendour. Michelangelo Lualdi's description exemplifies the genre:

To applaud the majestic pontificate of Innocent,
 architect of the delights . . . of the new fountain . . .
 the four famous rivers come from all parts of the world . . . ;
 and from the pierced rock, with a new miracle of art,
 they display their origins in this most majestic forum. . . .
 to increase the fountain's fame Egypt too
 augments its wandering beauties with one of her obelisks.
 [The obelisk] is placed in the centre of this most artful *macchina*:
 & is the first line of the marvel that strikes the eye of the curious spectator.⁴⁸

The poem singles out the pierced rock formation, from which water springs and over which the obelisk rests, as the source of delight that strikes the viewer's curious gaze. The technical feat of placing the weight of an obelisk over a void occasioned breathless marvel, acclaimed by Bernini's biographers and also described by Lualdi. Domenico Bernini celebrated the rock 'pierced by art' on all four sides so that the visitor might continually see the magnificence of the square through its arches (see fig. ●●) Filippo Baldinucci also marvelled to see the immense height of the obelisk suspended over a hollowed rock.⁴⁹ Others similarly described the fountain as a 'wonder of the world' or 'a wonder of our times', like the seven ancient wonders, in balancing the mighty Pamphili obelisk over a pierced rock.⁵⁰ In addition to this engineering feat of marvel, the poets, like the biographers, celebrated the fountain's ensemble as a monument and took delight in its detail. Like the Duke of Mantua's agent Francesco Mantovani, they were awed by its mastery of the viewer. Across Piazza Navona's vast and 'magnificent' space the soaring verticality of the spire was seen to rise up on its 'sublime pedestal', a massive travertine base. At the same time the poets were ravished by the fountain's delight in decorative details, which recalls its genesis within the milieu of decorative art – clusters of Indian figs and peonies for Asia; lilies and roses for Europe; a prickly pear cactus in flower; the criss-cross bark of the palm tree, whose furling leaves seem to bend with the wind. These vegetal forms made present the four corners of the earth for which they stood, in a complement of near and far, referencing

also the contemporary interest in collecting exotic flora for aristocratic gardens. The fountain's animals also enchanted the poets, both for the curiosity of exotic species, such as the armadillo from South America or the sea beasts of fabulous origin, and for the 'delightful rendering of their gestures' – the lion's flared nostrils, or the serpent's writhing form.⁵¹ Above all, the poets dwelt on the river gods as the fountain's protagonists, reading their gestural language as a series of declamatory attitudes proximate to those of ritual performance.

In an article on the iconography of the *Four Rivers* fountain of 1974 Rudolf Preimesberger identified the pose of the Rio della Plata figure as the antique gesture of *apokopein*.⁵² Founded in ancient Greek dance and drama and recorded in the visual arts, it is characterised by a raised hand that shades the eyes from a bright light, understood to signify an encounter with the godhead. Correspondingly, the Rio della Plata's left arm extends up before him with the palm of his hand turned flat to shield his gaze. He looks upwards and outwards from the fountain, with his mouth open and eyebrows raised in an expression of wonder, while his right arm reaches behind him and his body reels back in astonishment at what he sees (fig. 77). Building on Preimesberger's identification, we may further associate the poses of all Bernini's river gods with broadly generic examples of antique attitudes of worshipful awe. Their gestures of reverence are in keeping with the arts of the Church Triumphant that characterised much papal patronage across the seventeenth century. The ancient ritual gesture of worship, *orans*, is characterised by the raising of both arms, palms open and forwards, in a bodily manifestation of submission. Coupled with an appeal for mercy that derives from the gestural language of the response of the vanquished to military triumph, it was to become the most powerful expression of worship in the Christian tradition, both in ritual action and in art.⁵³ In Bernini's river gods this bodily language of awe runs through the forms of Rio della Plata, Danube and Nile. While Danube's attitude is less emphatic than that of Rio della Plata, he too leans backwards with his arms raised to suggest wondering awe at what he beholds. In this instance his gaze turns inwards and upwards towards the base of the obelisk and the Pamphili coat of arms that ornaments it (fig. 78). Similarly, Nile covers his head as an iconographic attribute of that river's unknown source, as has often been said, but his gesture of arms raised before him, coupled with the covering of the head may also intimate awe, even submission, before the sacred.⁵⁴

That the river gods were not carved by Bernini but by others according to his design is well documented;⁵⁵ while our critical judgement of these figures is of diminished sculptural quality in relation to other parts of the fountain, contemporaneous poetic reception sponsored by Rome's literary academies celebrated the river gods above all else. Understood as the locus of human action and so of the 'expression of the passions', the river gods were, in the eyes of the poets, the fountain's narrative agents, in keeping with this culture's prevailing conception of the visual arts as *istoria*. Their gestural language was ritualistic in derivation but also closely linked to that of theatre. In fact, seventeenth-century acting manuals advocated a gesture – closely related to *apokopein* – of the hand raised in front of the body to connote a generic surprise and wonderment. This gesture also appears in Gérard de Lairese's early eighteenth-century manual for artists, *Het groot schilderboek*, as the manifestation of admiration.⁵⁶ Similarly Charles Le Brun's *L'expression des passions* (1698) would also record this attitude as a visual manifestation of *étonnement* – astonishment (fig. 79).⁵⁷ More generally

Le Brun's great code rested on an early modern analysis of gesture as a system of 'natural' signs to constitute a universal language, as discussed in a series of seventeenth-century treatises on the subject. Giovanni Bonifacio's *L'arte dei cenni* (1616) is usually posited as the first of this literary genre, an attempt to describe all bodily signs of gesture and expression.⁵⁸ Much of this literature converged with contemporary acting manuals: for example, G. D. Ottonelli's *Della christiana moderazione del teatro* (1648) and *L'arte gesticolatoria* (1661) or Andrea Perrucci's later *Dell'arte rappresentativa* (1699), which shared an interest in classifying the affective language of the body. The Jesuit Ottonelli also published *Trattato della pittura e scultura* with Pietro da Cortona in 1652, again indicative of the densely interwoven ties between acting and the figurative arts in the study of gesture and pose.⁵⁹ All these texts referred to a common vocabulary of signifying gestures, derived from the canons of classical art and ancient treatises on rhetoric, which were themselves fused. Francis Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* (1605) characterised gesture as a form of knowledge founded in a natural congruity between motion and 'notion'. He drew these together with emblems to argue that gestures were 'transitory hieroglyphs', possessed of a natural 'affinity with the things signified'.⁶⁰ This train of thought resonated in John Bulwer's *Chirologia, or The Natural Language of the Hand . . . whereunto is added Chironomia, or The Art of Manual Rhetoric* (1644), a treatise that confined itself to the 'discoursing gestures' or 'hieroglyphics of the hand', undertaken through a series of textual descriptions of specific affects with their corresponding manual manifestations, illustrated by means of engravings. The fourth gesture of the *Chirologia* was that of 'admiration, amazement, and astonishment', historically derived from 'an appeal unto the Deity from whose secret operation all those wonders proceed . . . which, while we cannot comprehend, we raise our hands to heaven thereby acknowledging the hand and finger of God'.⁶¹ Bulwer here elides the embodiment of religious awe with a more generalised manifestation of marvelling reverence, in keeping with broader cultural practices. The gestures of Bernini's river gods issue from this same fusion of faith, hierarchy and affect within figurative languages of theatre, ritual and art.⁶²

Preimesberger tied Rio della Plata's gesture of *apokopein* to a larger iconographic argument that, following Kircher, understood the obelisk as emitting divine light, to which this figure responds. We may simultaneously view his pose, as well as those of the other river gods, as visual signs that cue a mimetic, embodied response on the part of the viewer. The figure of Ganges alone of the four does not declaim but instead looks outwards in a gesture of address to the square (fig. 80). Thus drawn in, the viewer's unfolding reception of the fountain's figural language must be one of conformity to the river gods' gestures of stupefaction. This wonder is surely doubled: within the pictorial logic of the fountain it signals the river gods' marvelling encounter with the obelisk's transfiguring light; it also encodes the viewer's perception of Bernini's feat of artistry in balancing the massive weight of an obelisk over a void, to offer an illusion of a floating weightlessness.

In fact a granite obelisk constitutes a vast weight. Those who witnessed the labour of moving and raising the Roman obelisks would have apprehended this through their recollection of the physical toil required for the task. Gigli's diary described how the Pamphili obelisk was found in five pieces in the Circus of Maxentius; the three smaller pieces were transported across the city on wagons pulled by great numbers of oxen, while the two larger fragments were dragged along the ground, little by little, over

many days, by means of great cables pulled by horses.⁶³ Prints of the moving and raising of the Vatican obelisk, under Sixtus V, still convey the scale of the work involved (fig. 81), and its raising was long considered the outstanding technical event of the century, much commented on in letters and *avvisi*. Such prints circulated across Europe as the record of a manmade wonder, a corollary to those of beached whales and other natural instances of the gigantic and the marvellous.⁶⁴ If the Pamphili obelisk appeared to float, the early modern viewer would have understood the depth of this fiction through the legacy of these prints and the memories of those who witnessed its arduous transport.

For the fountain's 'sublime pedestal' Bernini chose white travertine, carving only the river gods and the coats of arms from marble. Formed through calcium deposits on moss in springs and rivers, travertine was one of Rome's oldest and most plentiful building materials. Like the river gods, it referenced both rivers and antiquity. Because of its plant-based genesis, it is speckled with grainy perforations that lend it a porous, airy quality. Bernini carved it as rough-hewn rock yet the stone he chose appears light, cloud-like. Its form and material intimate the *papier-mâché* confections of festival processional floats and *apparati*, so heightening the drama of the weighty obelisk's suspension (fig. 82). Exceptionally in Bernini's oeuvre documentary sources demonstrate that details of the fountain were originally tinted with colour, or gilded, heightening its approximation to festival decorations.⁶⁵ These festive fabrications of painted wood, stucco, gesso, *papier-mâché*, clay and canvas were pre-eminently about the fiction of illusion, of form but also of materials. Painted wooden structures became buildings, monuments and cityscapes in miniature. Larger-than-life automata styled as fantastic creatures from myth and fable were made of painted *papier-mâché* or canvas over wire and wooden frames. Colossal stucco figures imitated marble, bronze or gold and silver, but also the semblance of life; in fact such effigies were often interchangeable with live 'actors' in costume, both on parade floats and in procession beside them, paradoxically made up to resemble the materials of art.⁶⁶

The central conceit of Lualdi's poem on the fountain is that of the river gods 'coming to life' as if they were actors in a series of *tableaux vivants*. They race from far-flung parts of the world to pay tribute to this great work of the Pamphili, along with the animals in their train. The lion, for example, emerges from the rock's aperture, panting, to quench his ardent thirst in the fountain's waters. Yet his motion is arrested by the stone of which he is made. Repeatedly, Lualdi both invents movement for the fountain's figures and recalls its fiction. And repeatedly he, like the d'Este agent, refers to the space of the fountain in which these 'actors' are figured as a 'teatro', with its early modern connotation of a place of witnessing illusion, art's fiction as life.⁶⁷ One anonymous poet described the fountain as a wonderful compendium of the world in bringing together four far-flung rivers, and perceived its richness of detail as a kind of *theatrum mundi*.⁶⁸ Early modern festival *relazioni* similarly used the term 'teatro' to describe Chastel's *lieu de la fête*, that space of ephemeral marvels resting on the city's material fabric in a playful confusion of art and life. In so doing these authors linked the reconfiguration of the piazza by means of the fountain to its parallel reworking through the medium of the festival. The d'Este agent and Lualdi, too, read the fountain's marvellous transformation of the square as like those of the princely fête.

Part of the carnival celebrations following the completion of the fountain in February 1652 comprised a comedy by Emilio Meli, entitled *La fontana pamfili* and dedicated to Innocent's nephew Prince Giovanni Battista Pamphili. The plot of the play turned around stock comedic characters and appears to have borne no direct relation to the fountain. References to the *Four Rivers* instead lay in the *intermezzi*. The prologue opened the play with a celebration of the fountain, enacted by allegorical figures of the four river gods, and concluded with their sung praise of the Pamphili and the work.⁶⁹ Again, the play links the *Four Rivers* to performance cultures as did Lualdi, using the fountain's figures as a point of departure into an enacted celebration of its fame. If festivals and their attendant ritual processions deployed musicians and singers to give voice to their scenographic effigies, this play, too, used song to define meanings for Bernini's river gods, endowing the fountain's figures with speech and motion. In this sense the *intermezzo* entertainment approximated the festival floats of popular Carnival celebrations, in which costumed figures enacted personifications or allegories on themed chariots deployed in parades. In Carnival's rich interweaving of high and low cultures, palace comedies similarly used the stock characters of Italy's popular comedic masks from the *commedia dell'arte*. In the palace and in the piazza, in poetry and in plays, Bernini's river gods were quickly absorbed into contingent cultures of performance. Lualdi's poetic evocation of the river gods as 'actors' within the fountain bore fruit in Meli's theatre.

* * *

An early painting of the *Four Rivers*, attributed to Filippo Gagliardi and dating to its immediate reception, represents a papal cortège in progress around the fountain (fig. 83).⁷⁰ Of minor artistic merit, its interest lies in how it represents both the monument and its audience. In the left foreground Bernini is shown mounted on a white horse, his position symmetrical with the depiction of Innocent seated in a covered sedan in the lower right corner. The fountain is rendered in a three-quarter rotation from its actual position within the square. This allows depiction of three of the four river gods – Nile in the centre, Rio della Plata's back to the right, and Ganges on the left. The cortège progresses around the fountain in order to view it from every aspect, then joining the artist on its east side. Their circumnavigation, coupled with the artist's rotation of the fountain, likens it to the revolving festival carousels of ceremonial display.

This painting, like the medals and models made after the *Four Rivers*, formed part of a broad and concerted re-signification of the square in the name of the fountain. This is also true of the papal cortèges that in fact attended its completion, in both their historical and representational forms. If the painting's three-quarter view of the fountain suggests the motion of a festival carousel, it also acknowledges the monument's status as a processional object, articulating a ritual turning point for the square. Nora's extensive anthology *Les lieux de mémoire* launched a scholarly attention to the role of monuments within structures of collective memory. Nora purposefully drew on Frances Yates's classic study of the early modern 'memory theatre', an investigation into the intellectual history of texts concerned with the art of memory, as well as Maurice Halbwach's work on collective memory, to suggest the role of cultural memory in the forging of collective identities. The texts Yates studied conceived of

memory in processional terms, as a progress through a building or space, marked by fixed moments before objects or places in which specific memories and so cultural identities were to seem to inhere and crystallise most clearly. Nora translated this mnemonic structure of thought from the realm of the text to a multiplicity of cultural spaces, including the material ones of monuments and historic sites. It is significant in this regard that Yates's texts were not concerned with specific historical buildings as memory theatres but rather with the construction of '*ficta loca*', fictional or imagined places, composites of existing or known edifices constructed within the realm of imagination from the building stones of memory.⁷¹ Yates's textual *ficta loca* find their spatial parallel in the festival *teatro*. The painting of the *Four Rivers* in Bernini's possession situates this monument, as I have argued the fountain itself also does, within such a nest of cultural memory. The fountain's work was to suggest rotation. It functioned as both a mnemonic and a commemorative object, to call to mind a cluster of collective memories in order to reify them as a form of cultural identity in imaged form. The memories were those of princely ritual; the identities those of the pope, his artist and his entourage – the audience that the painting depicts. The fountain acts as a mnemonic of the marvellous, built to resemble and thereby recall those wondrous transformations wrought by princely festival scenographies. The technical feat of its weightless weight coupled with its prodigious proportions referenced the pope's power as patron of this consummate artistry, Bernini's wondrous skill that defied the limits of material fabrication. This skill of illusion forged a monument of a seemingly impossible materiality in suspending a massive yet floating weight. The effects of this marvel were understood as playful and powerful in equal measure. Thus we may read the fountain as a visual metaphor of papal power within political cultures of early modern absolutism, embodying that effortless mastery of divine-right rule celebrated and extolled throughout political treatises of the period.⁷²

The Processional Object

Among the seventeenth-century manuscript holdings of the Biblioteca Lincei e Corsiniana in Rome is an anonymous codex containing a folio of epigrammatic inscriptions in draft, with various lines crossed through, revised or rewritten.⁷³ These Latin epigrams are in fact earlier versions of the inscriptions that would ornament the base of the Pamphili obelisk. What the manuscript permits is a view of the interlocutory process by which these carved epigrams were arrived at. The dialogue included Lualdi and Kircher, both of whom published earlier versions of the epigrams.⁷⁴ We can surmise that these epigrams took shape in conversations that formed part of, or were similar to, those in Rome's academies, which produced so much of the encomiastic verse surrounding the fountain's reception.

The inscriptions themselves both reflect and represent the literary culture that produced them. The epigram facing north is historical in orientation, like that of a foundation inscription, establishing the origins of the obelisk in Rome and its raising in 1651 under Innocent's patronage. Those facing south and east proclaim the purpose of this patronage: to ennoble this celebrated square with the fountain's majesty as a princely gift to the city. Finally the inscription facing west onto the small church of Sant'Agnese, built over the presumed site of this early Christian martyr's grave and

soon to be rebuilt, fully engages in a play of words and images paradigmatic of the courtly, literary and festive cultures from which the fountain and its epigrams issued: 'Above the strange Egyptian creatures hovers the innocent dove, which, wreathed in lilies of virtue, offering the olive branch of peace and claiming the obelisk as its trophy, triumphs over Rome.' The inscription underlines the Pamphili dove's supremacy over the Egyptian lore of the hieroglyphs in a metaphor of papal triumph. These details of the fountain, like the river gods, the obelisk, and the rock formation, repeat Innocent's claim to dominion over time, and over both local and global space. They also echo and amplify the themes of festival decorations for Innocent's inauguration in their proclamation of the reach of his power across histories and geographies.

Among the many celebratory verses composed about the fountain, one by Ludovico Leporeo stands out in its attempt to imitate the wonders he beheld. While the poetry is weak, the device is playful, each line composed of words beginning with the same letter, to conclude: 'Meraviglia maggior mirasti, mondo' ('World, admire this great marvel').⁷⁵ I have argued that the fountain's prehension of the marvellous turns around a play of counterpoints: the model and the monument; permanent and ephemeral; princely and popular; private and public; local and global; long ago and far away. In this, and in its form, the fountain imitates the wondering delights of festival decoration. I want now to look closely at the history of viewing the fountain, to consider how its form both participated in and commanded the trope of the marvellous through which it was seen. If it is the object that constructs its ideal viewing distance, its 'lure', I will suggest that in the case of the *Four Rivers* fountain this is multiple. The fountain engages a moving crowd. Lualdi spoke of the fountain's 'wandering beauties'; at the same time he recognised the power of the obelisk as 'the first line of the marvel that strikes the eye'. Let us consider what his 'first line' of sight might be. Mantovani's letter on Bernini's design for the fountain acknowledged the need for the work to command the space of this vast and magnificent square (fig. 84). It surely reflects broader discussion about this key piece of urban scenography in the renovation of the piazza. Mantovani reports the consideration that the base of the fountain served to raise the obelisk to a height sufficient to command the vast dimensions of the square, by means of a tall pedestal he called 'sublime'. Entrance to the square, then as now, was at either end of the length of the piazza and on either side of its centre. Since the square, following the shape of the ancient stadium, is significantly longer than it is broad, the views of the obelisk from the far ends of the piazza must master extensive sight lines. As Mantovani and doubtless others foresaw, this is achieved by giving the obelisk a towering vertical height. The placement of the obelisk so that its facets are parallel to the lines of the square makes its alignment to the space emphatic. This planimetric view from either length of the square is surely Lualdi's 'first line of the marvel that strikes the eye'.

I have also picked out the carved detail of the fountain, in which the poets delighted: its climbing roses, delicate lily petals, the swish of the horse's tail, the play of water over craggy facets of travertine. Anonymous seventeenth-century verse celebrated also the soft sounds of the murmuring fountain, the fall of water as liquid crystal, floating reflections of the fountain's form in the waters of the basin.⁷⁶ If the height of the obelisk commanded the view from afar, delight in details of sight and sound drew the viewer into a plethora of more intimate pleasures. From far and near the poets also understood the fountain as precipitating motion around its circumference to view

what Lualdi termed its 'wandering beauties'. The river gods' reclining poses, arranged across the travertine rock, coupled with their outstretched arms and legs, forge strong lateral lines of composition around the fountain base. If the Ganges looks out into the viewer's space the other river gods' lines of vision traverse the fountain. The viewer's gaze follows theirs, tracing also the lateral trailing vegetation across the rock. Serpentine forms weave in and out of the water to solicit the viewer's moving eye. The rock's quadripartite openings beckon too. Horse and lion appear through the void so that we meet the head in one opening, the body later in another. The viewer's specular apprehension of the fountain is that of rotation, of procession around its circumference. In this sense we may understand it as a ritual object, constructed for and by its ceremonial role as a turning point in the square. If the fountain solicits a circular movement around it, this is fitting. And the illusion of rotation that Gagliardi, Lualdi and Fehrenbach recognised in the fountain is the mirror of this bodily movement of its audience, that makes of it a carousel.

In addition to the plethora of views from the square, the fountain was also built to be seen from the stately windows of the Palazzo Pamphili's *piano nobile* (fig. 85). Rio della Plata's and Danube's gestures of worshipful awe upwards to the massive height of the obelisk dominate the view from the palace (see figs 77 and 78). It is significant that much of the celebratory poetry about the fountain dwells on those aspects seen from a higher viewpoint. The poets of the court wrote of the fountain as it appeared from the windows of the palace, or those of a passing carriage, whether in procession or *passeggiata*. The view from the window, from a distance and from a height approximated more closely the view of the tabletop model within the palace interior, for both permitted the viewer a transcendence over the fountain's form. We may recall that Innocent's successor, Pope Alexander VII, kept a model of the city of Rome as a whole from which to oversee its urban development. While the view of the model, like the view from the window, approximates an 'imperial gaze', the fountain on the ground instead dominates the viewer by virtue of its overmastering size.⁷⁷ Rio's gesture, seen from the window, may be read as one of reverence before the pope and his entourage, standing above within the palace, while from the piazza it instills a ritual conformity to his pose that references subject-hood. This play of scale and of sight lines, bound up with the physical and social spectrum of the fountain's audiences, also recalls the inversions of scale that characterised much festive art: the repetition of figures as exquisite miniature table ornaments or *trionfi* for aristocratic banquets, and blown up as gigantic automata for parade floats in public squares; or architectural motifs, such as arches and obelisks, for large-scale scenographies, reduced to miniature proportions for a multiplicity of ornamental designs. These festive amplifications in themselves constituted a form of wonderment, in which the monumental forms of the fountain shared. Colossal scale ornamented by exquisite detail was central to the fountain's work as a form of the marvellous.

Hieroglyphics

Kircher's *Obeliscus Pamphilius* (1650), to the frustration of iconographic investigations of the fountain, did not attempt to make connections between the hieroglyphs of the obelisk and the figures on the base or the very inscriptions that he may have had a

hand in drafting. The book's interests are more general, concerned with a history of the obelisk and ancient Egyptian religious beliefs, and an understanding of hieroglyphs as arcane revelations of a coming Christianity. Beyond this, Kircher's endeavour was to wrap the hieroglyphs in veils of reading to convey the mystery of their layered 'meanings'.⁷⁸ Moreover, the specific decodings of the hieroglyphs that he made were met with revisions by his circle of readers. My point is that Kircher and his contemporaries understood his interpretation as suggestive rather than definitive, and that the text itself formed part of a broader culture of learned conversation about the obelisk in lettered circles close to the papal court.⁷⁹ To exemplify the layered 'meanings' of this literary culture, one poet suggested to his audience that they remove the veil covering Nile's eyes in order to enlist this ancient river god as an 'interpreter' of the hieroglyphs.⁸⁰ The fountain as a whole is a product of this culture, its form accommodating a multiplicity of readings and enactments. The preparatory drawings and models for the fountain, like the drafts of its inscriptions, suggest the emergence of this monument through a web of discursive readings. This process of rereading, rewriting, 'restaging' the fountain continued not only during its fabrication but after its completion, set into play through the constellation of cultures out of which it grew.

Discursiveness was also manifest in papal-sponsored social rituals enacted around the *Four Rivers* in the years immediately after its completion. From 1651 to Innocent's death in 1655 all events in Piazza Navona were of his patronage and related to his redefinition of this space in his image. Court theatre and festival forms, like poetry, continued to produce new 'meanings' for the fountain, extending well beyond its completion in June 1651. Meli's enactment of the fountain's river gods in his carnival comedy of 1652 brought references to the *Four Rivers* into the realm of palace theatre, those private productions put on during Carnival that drew on the popular forms of the *commedia dell'arte*. This was swiftly followed by the initiation of the ritualised pastime of *allagamento* in Piazza Navona, consisting of a wholesale flooding of the square by means of the fountain's waters. Sources document its first occurrence in Piazza Navona on 23 June 1652, and it was to continue annually in the summer months, as Lieven Cruyl's illustration of c. 1670 demonstrates (fig. 86). Giacinto Gigli describes how water issued from the fountains of Piazza Navona 'to form a lake above the ground, creating a pastime for carriages which drove across it'.⁸¹ The inference is a revealing one, for the horse-drawn carriage was a development of the late sixteenth century that quickly established itself as the essential transport of the elite, its presence transforming the social character of urban spaces.⁸² The processional *passeggiata* of the *allagamento*, sponsored by the Pamphili, further served to define the square as an ennobled space and drew it more securely into the ambit of the Pamphili's princely palaces, as if it were a forecourt to their residence and thus host to their festive entertainments. Across Rome's squares, but especially Piazza Navona, the *allagamento* was a key event of the mid-seventeenth century. Visual records, as well as textual descriptions, show squares filled with lavish carriages in procession, for all Rome's great families sent gold-painted and ornately carved carriages drawn by richly harnessed horses and followed by their livery. Papal cavalry and artillery led the parades, followed by the papal train, then the carriages of the aristocracy. Palace terraces and windows festooned with costly tapestries became exclusive viewing spaces onto a privatised event in a once-public space. At the close of the procession, as the carriages

left, sponsors threw money into the waters, which those spectators on foot and excluded from the cortège then waded in to collect.

The *allagamenti* produced new readings of the fountain within court circles, through a series of extended references to water.⁸³ Chief among these were references to Noah, the ark and the biblical flood in elaborations of the dove within Pamphili heraldry, as in Innocent's inauguration. It also touched on the annual flooding of the Nile, which could be mapped onto the occasional flooding of the Tiber as a reference to Rome's inheritance of these ancient Egyptian legacies. Again, the references commingled the biblical with the classical, in keeping with the humanist culture of the papal court, and the politics of a Church Triumphant. The *allagamento* was further understood as a reference to the antique festival of the *naumachia*, or staged naval triumph, which commonly featured in princely festivals throughout the early modern period. In the case of Piazza Navona the reference was deepened by the historical memory of fabricated festival 'ships' in mock naval battles, such as that constructed for the Barberini welcome for the Prince of Poland in 1634.⁸⁴

The *allagamento* was also linked to the claim of Innocent's commemorative medal for the fountain, which bore the inscription: 'Abluto Aqua Virgine Agonalium Cruore' ('May the waters of the Acqua Vergine wash away the blood of the feast of Janus'), a reference to the Christian martyrs killed in the ancient games of the Agone in Piazza Navona.⁸⁵ This metaphor of the fountain as washing or cleansing Piazza Navona was far-reaching. After the *Four Rivers* was complete, the pope instructed Bernini to remodel the square's southern fountain. This was to become the *Fontana del Moro*, and Bernini's work on it continued for the remainder of Innocent's reign.⁸⁶ Together these fountains delineated the centre line of the square with sculptural decoration that played on its supposed identification as an antique circus. It was around these markers that the athletes of Rome's ancient games had raced, often to their death. In this sense the fountains were read as washing away the blood shed by the early martyrs as forced competitors in the Roman games. Yet this recollection is also a commemoration, a cleansing that purifies in order to re-present rather than expunge. What the medal's inscription recalled was the foundations of Catholicism in the blood of the early martyrs and so in turn the institution of the papacy that Innocent represented, his family name and pontifical power in turn embodied in the constructed imagery of the fountain.

* * *

Let us now revert to the river gods' gestures of awe and submission, whose historic force, I have argued, was to produce a mimetic bodily conformity within its viewing audience. In linking the gestures to Bacon's concept of the 'transitory hieroglyph' my purpose is two-fold: to ground the discussion historically and materially; and to posit the hieroglyph as an analytical frame, in the figurative sense. In another context, Benedict Anderson has written of the 'sacred silent languages of imperialism' as hieroglyphs, whose unspoken work is to sanitise its acts of force. W. J. T. Mitchell has similarly argued for an analysis of landscapes as 'hieroglyphs of imperialism', constructed so as to naturalise the violence through which land, historically, is possessed. The land-as-emblem both speaks of that possession and veils the means of its procurement. The structure of Mitchell's analysis depends on a reading of the social hieroglyph

that embodies the social relations of its production yet conceals them within its finished form, serving to veil or naturalise the very processes of its constitution. Mitchell further deepened the analogy in analysing landscape as the ‘dreamwork’ of imperialism.⁸⁷ If we transpose this to the urban landscapes of papal absolutism we may see Baroque Rome’s urban development, and specifically Bernini’s fountain, as a social hieroglyph whose sublime artistry makes manifest the presence of the prince in perpetuity. By arrogating the forms of the princely festival, the fountain made permanent those temporary festive reinventions of the square, in an artistic act of urbanism. In so doing, like the festival, it worked to forge a *ficta loca*, to reify a princely spectacle in permanent form. Kircher’s reading of the obelisk’s hieroglyphs as mysterious, veiled yet powerful transmitters of the sun’s energy, may stand as a metaphor for the pope’s dominion, which the forms of Bernini’s pedestal repeat and extend.

Monuments and Memory

As with the raising of an obelisk, the achievement of running water in Piazza Navona rested on elaborate technology and extensive, highly visible labour. Drawing on the waters of the ancient aqueduct the Acqua Vergine (which was restored successively during the Renaissance and of which Bernini was made architect under the Barberini pontificate), the *Four Rivers* shared its source with many other fountains across the city, few of which achieved plentiful flow. Local audiences were attentive to the hydraulic technology of the water’s rise in Piazza Navona, long seen as an impossibility – hence the pope’s famed delight on first seeing water course through the fountain.⁸⁸ As illustrated in topographic prints, the *Four Rivers* fountain replaced a communal drinking trough (see fig. 70). Barriers ensured that the fountain did not accrue the functions of the former trough. Thus, among the means by which the fountain re-designated the square into a *teatro* was the conversion of a drinking trough’s useful water into the ornamental cascades of decorative fall. Prior to its replacement, the trough was given ephemeral guises during festive occasions that presaged the construction of the *Four Rivers*, part of the larger ‘restaging’ of the square initiated in festival decoration. Engendering sufficient water pressure for the *Four Rivers* would have involved large teams of workers in the square, and was necessarily undertaken before the paving of the piazza. These highly visible labours – moving the obelisk, attending to the hydraulics, paving the square, as well as rebuilding Palazzo Pamphili and Sant’Agnese, and constructing the fountain – meant that the piazza was a vast worksite for much of the Pamphili reign. While the finished works subsumed within themselves the history of their own production, local audiences bore witness to the labours of this process. The fountain, for them, could only ever be a split mnemonic, a monument to papal scenographies but also the locus of other collective memories: of the labours of its making, and of the loss of an ancient communal space, coupled with the erasure of its prior histories, especially those memories adhering to the ancient material fabric of the place.

Thus, if the authors of Rome’s *avvisi* echo the court poets in telling us that ‘all Rome applauds [the *Four Rivers* fountain], all run to view and admire it’,⁸⁹ they also record another side to the fountain’s reception. In contrast to the fountain’s official court inauguration, carefully orchestrated by the Pamphili, was the troubled response of

those who lived and worked within the fabric of the square. As the local inhabitants and workers of the area fully understood, Bernini's fountain and the urban development of the square it accompanied were instrumental in 'cleansing' the piazza in other, social, senses – of its neighbourhood and communal uses, chiefly its market, and those quotidian practices that had grown up around these functions and amid the ruins of the ancient stadium.

The incursion of the fountain into Piazza Navona's daily life extended not only into the realms of the social and cultural but comprised also the economic history of the square. My interest is not in the larger history of papal finance, but strictly in its role in colouring local reception of new papal monuments. Residents of the area paid for new works, through taxes on foodstuffs – bread, salt, meat – in addition to a general head tax. Vendors who came to sell in the daily food market also paid, through renewed licence fees for their stalls.⁹⁰ Thus their collective memories of the fountain's construction were shaped by the economic histories that accompanied it. The fountain's courtly, papal magnificence and festive wonder triumphed over neighbourhood histories and customs, and at their expense. When the obelisk appeared in the piazza in 1648 it was rumoured to have cost 12,000 *scudi* to move, its labour reckoned not as papal largesse but as a form of 'conspicuous consumption' set against the means of its financing. 1649 was the year in which the obelisk went up above the fountain; it was also a year of floods, failed harvests, grain shortages and rocketing prices for bread. As work on the fountain began, according to the diarists, unhappy crowds of locals several times attempted forced entry to Pamphili properties. Moreover, there were frequent popular uprisings in the square that made it dangerous for nobles and ecclesiastics to go out.⁹¹ As the fountain neared completion Innocent's continuing legislation to accompany his reclamation of the piazza deepened this conflict of cultures. Days before the opening Innocent banned the longstanding daily food market from the square.⁹² Innocent's edict proclaimed that the piazza was no longer to be cluttered with the impediments and rubbish of a market, but instead to be enjoyed for its beauty, free of vendors and their wares.⁹³ Gigli registered the social semantics of this transformation, describing the square as now 'fit only for carriages'. In contrast to the d'Este agent, the Roman diarist Teodoro Ameyden described Piazza Navona as 'of no use whatever to the public'. Instead it had become a 'teatro'.⁹⁴

The *Fountain of the Four Rivers* received both a carefully orchestrated official reception, and a vociferous counter-cultural response, because it epitomised city-wide changes in early modern Rome's urban development: a gradual transformation by the papacy of the ancient, public and communal spaces of the city. Previously marked by drinking troughs, markets and fairs, as at Piazza Navona, Rome's abundant squares became scenographic forefronts to the palaces of papal families like the Pamphili, adorned by fountains and sculpture. This restructured the mental map of Rome's traditional city districts to create new cultural zones, centred around papal families who sought to make their presence visible within the urban fabric of the city. This was part of a larger process of political change that saw the diminution of Rome's ancient, communal governing bodies in favour of increased papal power over the city.⁹⁵ By means of art, Rome's once communal spaces now became tied symbolically to elite strongholds of power, wresting them from *comune* to court. What was at stake was the redefinition of 'public' in relation to the city's traditional communal spaces and the private family dwelling of the incumbent pope. Following a pattern already established

by the Farnese and the Barberini, the Pamphili employed Bernini to bring Piazza Navona within their signifying field.⁹⁶ As cultural geographers would recognise, this history of claiming city space through cultural re-signification is one of dominant groups.⁹⁷ The process produced a fusion, or confusion, of public space with private interests. Its means were visual – sculpture, architecture, ornament, but also the ephemeral arts of festivals. As patrons, early modern popes deployed the visual arts to effect this transformation. Bernini was the consummate visual exponent of their aspirations. The closure of the market, along with the refashioning of a humble drinking trough into a fountain of stupefying artistry, was intended to re-designate cultural access to the square. The water supply of the piazza was no longer to serve a utilitarian function but, according to the fountain's inscriptions, to lend majesty and magnificence to the square.

The Ritual Landscape

Like the plastic arts of architecture and sculpture, ritual too served to transform cultural expectations of public space. Thus ceremonies, processions and calendular entertainments that unfolded in civic space were transformed in the image of the papacy.⁹⁸ The locus of such reinvention lay in the gradual transmutation of ritual form, the historical process by which ancient communal civic rituals were absorbed into sovereign ceremony, as in 1634. If we understand ritual as a type of performance, drawn from lived experience, then its cumulative force is to reshape the social relations it also reflects. Repetition is central to its work. It is through its live reiteration that the ritual act seeds collective memory, and so forges group identities. The early modern festival exemplified this process. Its work was to reify the prince.

Commemorative places and their monuments, like ritual acts, are particularly dense with collective memories. Within ritual they reinforce one another, for 'memorative' objects and sites form the cluster points around which the force of a ceremony may converge. The memory of festival decoration informed subsequent development of sculptural and architectural ornament in Rome's streets and squares. In this way buildings and monuments were marked by ritual forms. Especially in a monument, the materials of memory might coalesce, as in ceremony, to celebrate a collective identity. The built environment became the *ficta loca* that Yates described. In its architectural imitation of the princely festival, the material fabric of Rome came to resemble the rituals it hosted. This decorative residue of the city's processional life made of Rome a permanently ceremonial city, its spaces of festive display forged in perpetuity. In Rome's public spaces we may map, literally, the effects of ritual action on the cityscape, for the history of the urban square was indelibly interwoven with that of its public life. This is the twin development I will trace. Piazza Navona's development remade the square as a theatre of princely display, resonant with the visual languages of a court culture. It had already been reconfigured ephemerally in the image of the prince, prior to the Pamphili redevelopment of the square, through a series of princely festivals, which also became the model for a parallel reconfiguration of Rome's inherited ritual traditions. Thus the spectacle of the princely festival produced the Baroque scenographic city square as the permanent 'stage set' for its display. The transmutation of urban space and ritual form went hand in hand. As longstanding communal rituals

were increasingly reformulated in the image of princely festivals, the ongoing need for appropriate urban scenographies became more pronounced. As the city's ceremonial sites assumed ever more courtly forms, this facilitated the historic drive to render ritual in its image. Thus these two strands of visual urban culture, ephemeral and permanent, both developed in step with broader political histories. As they changed, the range of cultural memories they might invoke changed also. This was the point: to deploy these various visual languages to call to mind the institutions of the church, the papacy, the papal court; and concomitantly to cleanse cultural memory of other popular, communal associations. Vestiges of their earlier identities lived on as increasingly empty husks. 1634 epitomised this process in its fusion of a royal entry with Carnival. Thus the 'popular' festival of Carnival began to imitate and approximate those princely celebrations of royal births, deaths, marriages, entries and accessions. The nub of Baroque ritual lay in this assimilation.⁹⁹ Rome's urban development embodied in perpetuity the ritual histories out of which it grew.

So, the choreography of Innocent's *possesso* of 1644 as papal panegyric was in keeping with a broader early modern history of ceremonial form. In fact, scholars of Catholic ritual single out the papal *possesso* as the outstanding example of ceremonial transformation into princely celebration. It had a direct link to the renovation of Piazza Navona, for through this inaugural rite Innocent began to transform the ritual space of Piazza Navona in the image of a triumphant papacy. The papal cavalcade had traditionally passed through the small square adjacent to Piazza Navona, Piazza Parione; Innocent altered the route to pass through Piazza Navona too. In this way future popes and their processions would forever derive their power through reference to his reign, and his monumentalisation of the city landscape.¹⁰⁰ Concomitantly, he transformed Piazza Navona's role: once host to popular markets and communal festivals such as Carnival, it increasingly took on a new form of processional life, of celebrating papal magnificence in keeping with Bernini's fountain. Thus the newly ornamented, paved, cleansed expanse of the piazza was reconceived as a stage set for the papacy's parallel conversion of age-old rituals into the ceremonials of absolutism.

As the fountain went up, and after its completion, its troubled history continued. What was at issue was a conflict of cultures and of cultural memories, local and papal, that clashed in the material fabric of the square. Renaissance map-makers had believed Piazza Navona to have been a circus where the brutal and demotic games of the Roman empire were held. This surely reflected medieval Rome's Rabelaisian use of the space, for similar competitive games ending in death survived into the fifteenth century at Carnival time, as did the performance of popular burlesque comedies. Like large public spaces all over Europe the square was also used for public executions throughout the Middle Ages and beyond.¹⁰¹

Of course Piazza Navona was always a meeting place for high and low cultures, and was used also for courtly displays before visiting sovereigns, in common with other large spaces of the medieval city's urban fabric. Yet historians distinguish the early modern period as one increasingly repressive of the festival's popular face. More than any other festival, Carnival celebrations underwent an about-face in the hands of the early modern papacy. The once liminal nature of this world-turned-upside-down and grassroots festival was increasingly tamed by alternative spectacles that the church promulgated in its image. Thus the ritual transformation of ancient popular and

communal spaces of the city into honorific, ceremonial stage sets for the encomiastic festive celebration of the papacy accompanied vast changes to Rome's urban fabric.¹⁰²

The use of painted, ephemeral obelisks for the Resurrection parade in Piazza Navona at Easter 1650, anticipated and mirrored the architectural and sculptural forms that were shortly to change the piazza forever. In a metaphorical sense, too, it presaged the effects of Pamphili urbanisation on Piazza Navona. Enclosing the majority of the space of the piazza within a *teatro* of painted arches picked out by torches, the festival echoed the social redefinition that Pamphili redevelopment effectively wrought upon the life of the square (see fig. ●●). The central space was set apart from the ordinary life of the neighbourhood by artifice: wooden architecture and painting, as well as fireworks and the costumed processive ritual that passed through it – these ephemeral effects transposed the piazza. In giving permanent form to these ceremonial changes, Bernini cemented Pamphili conquest of the space. The deployment of permanent art and the continuous implementation of elite festival forms worked to change the square's social register in perpetuity.

* * *

Such a process of artistic redefinition of space as was effected at Piazza Navona is the work of a triumphalist history. If the fountain, like the festival, forms part of a princely *imaginaire*, its work upon the memorative associations of the urban landscape was similar. The fountain's genesis through the intermediary forms of decorative and ephemeral festival art highlights this princely procurement of a once communal space through the artistry of a court culture. My interest lies in the use of visual cultures – sculpture, architecture, but also the processions of ceremonial ritual – to reclaim urban space. As cultural geographers Rosalyn Deutsche and Gillian Rose have argued in rewriting Henri Lefebvre, the relationship between the social and the spatial is a contested one.¹⁰³ This applies not only to material but also to representational space. Thus papal urbanism cleansed the landscape of its 'other' cultural memories to construct its own teleology through the form of the fountain. Urban renovation and monumental artistry were the means by which this was effected. To read papal urbanism in these terms is to understand its triumphal fabrications as emblems of dominance. Thus the fountain may be understood as a semiophore of the social relations it paradoxically both embodied and concealed. If Kircher placed the hieroglyphs of the Pamphili obelisk beyond the reach of a simple decoding, Bernini's base of reclining river gods in gestures of awe emblematised papal dominance through Bacon's 'transitory hieroglyphs' of gestural language. Historical anthropologies have long regarded ritual actions as 'hieroglyphic' in the figurative sense of unspoken signs that embody cultural ideologies in concentrated form, and which effect their power through participants' bodily mimesis. At the same time the ritual act is understood as multivocal, located at an intersection of cultural forces and latent meanings and so able to sustain a multiplicity of readings.¹⁰⁴ If we understand the fountain as a ritual object embedded within festival forms, its gesturing effigies interchangeable with actors in a *tableau vivant*, then its oscillating language of triumph and supplication partakes of the paradox of ritual action, able to sustain an array of 'meanings'. Near and far, global and local, miniature and model, weighty and weightless may also be resolved into this. If the fountain invited the playful commentary of the poets in the form of embroideries and

elaborations that defied an iconographic fixity, yet the message is clear. The story of the monument is the representation of mastery. The mastery signified is the pope's, through his artist's skill. The artistry that delights is wrought in a language of dialectical play that both disguises and displays the triumph of its design. In this way it represents the seemingly naturalised sovereignty of an absolutist court culture.¹⁰⁵

Pasquinade

In the small square adjacent to Piazza Navona stands a ravaged antique torso known as Pasquino, its limbs lost and its face mutilated by time (fig. 87). The square, called Piazza Parione throughout the Middle Ages because of the quarter of Rome in which it lies, became known as Piazza Pasquino in recognition of this piece of sculpture. Dating from ancient Rome's Republican era, the torso had lain for centuries half buried in this square before being reinstated to an upright position during the Renaissance.

From this elevated position Pasquino became an unofficial mouthpiece of protest against various forms of papal excess.¹⁰⁶ Following the Sack of Rome in 1527 the ventriloquist torso regularly spoke out against papal policy, above all nepotism and lavish expenditure. Among his myriad concerns were the cultural consequences of urban renovation and specifically the loss of collective memories adhering to disappearing landmarks and ancient monuments. The transformation of Rome's squares from communal spaces into elite stage sets by means of monumental sculptural fountains, as at Piazza Navona, preoccupied him frequently. While the origins of Pasquino's powers of speech appear to lie in a sixteenth-century humanist literary festival, this sculpture was also drawn into a longer Roman folkloric tradition of 'speaking statues'. Popular oral tradition ascribed dialogue, distinct characters, and sometimes costumes to these ancient sculptures in the public domain. Many of these, like Pasquino, were unearthed during Rome's extensive Renaissance re-urbanisation, chief among them the colossal river god Marforio, who was often Pasquino's dialogic companion. Thus Pasquino became part of a picturesque anthropological seam of Rome's popular urban history. The means of Pasquino's sculptural speech took the form of anonymous verse pasted to his socle and surrounding walls. The authors of these 'pasquinades' purported to write in the voice of this sculptural remnant, and appended their satiric verses to the piece by night to ensure their anonymity.¹⁰⁷ A sixteenth-century print of Pasquino illustrates the practice (fig. 88). It depicts Pasquino on a plinth against a palace wall with a series of pasquinades above and around him. Below, on the base, is a lengthier verse, written in his name as a mocking explanation of his identity:

I am not, though I seem so, a mutilated baboon, without feet and hands . . .
But rather that famous Pasquino who terrifies the most powerful . . .
when I compose in Italian or Latin.
I owe my physique to the blows of those whose faults I faithfully recount.¹⁰⁸

Our knowledge of Pasquino's speech is inevitably ephemeral, deriving from chance reports in diaries and in the Roman *avvisi*. The interest for students of Rome's history of architecture and urban development is that these records yield a source of unofficial response to the artistic monuments of an absolutist papacy, an otherwise unwritten

counterpoint to the seamless and marvelling encomia of their official reception. Like graffiti, the pasquinades signalled an attempt to reclaim cultural space symbolically with a mark.¹⁰⁹ By means of pasquinades, papal critics resisted and occasionally redefined those projects of urban renovation of which Bernini was so often the architect. Thus the link between Pasquino and protest was not idle. As Johan Huizinga would surmise, the ludic pasquinade was a game of intent. Papacies perceived it as such, and their repression of pasquinades was often severe and uncompromising. Apprehended authors were arrested, imprisoned, and by way of punishment maimed or even put to death. My focus here is not, in itself, on the broader political issues that animated these debates: while reference to them is necessary to an analysis of the resulting dialogue, my attention is focused on the act of sculptural theatre and its social signifiers, of which content formed only a part. The structure of these sculptural ‘improvisations’ was contingent, embedded in a history of oral performance culture and street theatre that we may read through the mouth of Pasquino.

Pasquinades were also posted in Piazza Navona, revealing that the *Four Rivers* fountain took shape surrounded by a multitude of opposing voices throughout its fabrication. After its completion it continued to excite an ongoing critical reception that engendered ventriloquist re-enactments of its capacity for meaning. Along with the protests of erstwhile market sellers and small uprisings by local inhabitants, the issues at stake in Piazza Navona crystallised in pasquinades against the material and symbolic redevelopment of the square. As the pieces of the Pamphili obelisk arrived in the piazza, the vast cost of their transport was quickly reckoned against the rising cost of bread in the failed harvests of 1648. This dialogue of dissent found a lasting exposition in subversive poetry. The diarist Gigli records:

while the pieces of the obelisk arrived in Piazza Navona, people began to say that it wasn’t the time for incurring such expense, when there was a shortage of bread and grain. Thus it was that the following verses were found attached to the stones:

We don’t want obelisks and fountains.

It’s bread we want, bread, bread, bread.¹¹⁰

Thus the anonymous poets of the piazza pasted their verse of protest onto the obelisk fragments themselves, transforming the very materials of Bernini’s art into agents of response. While Kircher bestowed one form of identity upon the obelisk fragments – that of recondite and arcane knowledge – pasquinaders attributed a contrasting significance to their presence in the square, turning these ancient stones into cultural shields against encroaching papal development. The pasquinades quipped: ‘Oh Lord, make these stones into bread!’¹¹¹ In contrast to the rich papal cavalcade that would mark the official commemoration of the erection of the obelisk, Pasquino instead spoke on behalf of those who bore the expense through local residents’ taxes: ‘Innocent consecrated this obelisk to eternity, erected at the expense of us innocents.’¹¹²

As the fountain reached completion, the voices of official reception fought to maintain centre stage. Innocent used the jubilee festivals of 1650 in the square to generate fresh acclaim for his work. Notwithstanding this orchestrated display of official reception, discontent perdured. The reception history of papal redevelopment at Piazza Navona crystallises the broader issues at stake, because it is here that the modern sculptures Pasquino criticised were, apparently, shamed into response. Those who had

previously written critical verse as if from the mouth of Pasquino were now said to enact their response through the sculptures in the piazza itself. Thus Bernini's own works, in the hands of the pasquinaders, 'spoke' against the pope that commissioned them. The discontent of the plainants focused on the Pamphili edict banning the daily food market, which, coupled with the renovations, changed the social register of the square.¹¹³ Bernini's figure of the Nile (fig. 89) was thus reinvented as a satiric *tableau vivant*. He hid his head, it was said, for shame so as not to see the great inequalities of wealth dwelling in the piazza: locals no longer able to sell goods at market set against the palaces of the Pamphili family and the piazza's new role as their forecourt.¹¹⁴

Immediately upon completion of the fountain, the Pamphili initiated work on Sant'Agnese. Over the next twenty years they would transform this ancient parish church adjoining their palace into what would become a family mausoleum. Bernini's great rival Borromini was appointed as architect. Their famous enmity was said to be played out in the square, as if enacted through the sculptures themselves. The sculpture of St Eugenia on the exterior balustrade of the church (fig. 90) would be reconceived as part of this popular 'theatre', in which the sculptures apparently spoke in comic vein. The gesture of her right hand on her chest, derived from ancient texts on oratory, denotes the act of speech but also its sincerity. She places all four fingers of her hand flat to her chest so that they are easily legible in a bodily configuration of honesty. This gesture's 'meaning' was humorously reattributed in light of current events in the square: the saint was said to signal the number four with her fingers to indicate the spiralling cost of food, inflated by papal taxes to pay for the renovations. As fears mounted about Borromini's ambitious cupola for the church, St Eugenia's gesture of hand on chest was also said to vouchsafe that it would not fall. Bernini's figure of the Rio della Plata, who raises his hand before his face, was also reread as part of a popular burlesque (see fig. 77); his gesture of awestruck wonder became instead one of fear of the cupola's fall, so tying Rio to a rich dialogue of anecdotal criticisms of new papal architecture, which often centred on Bernini too.¹¹⁵

Thus, on the one hand, a chorus of officially staged voices rose in celebration of the Pamphili, the artists, the church, the obelisk and the fountain. On the other hand, a series of extempore, satirical exchanges, apparently enacted by pieces of public sculpture, articulated sharp criticism of all of the above. Their differing responses, and modes of response, intermingled in the social space of the square-cum-'theatre'.

The historic locus of such popular comedic dialogue within Italy was the *commedia dell'arte*, a form of theatre that developed out of the popular masking in the weeks of Carnival preceding Lent. The interplay with the ritual calendar was marked. During these weeks the traditional comedic forms of Carnival, extempore performances, were staged in squares and on street corners, in ambulant caravans or makeshift theatres. These improvisations used familiar stock characters based on social caricature, the contrast of social types – the Neapolitan thief, the intriguing servant, the dissolute soldier. This was central to their comic effect, each character a caricature of its social genre and distinguished by dialect and expression, by costume and attributes, and by gestural movement. Dialogic banter depended on a cultural tradition of structured improvisation, whereby each new utterance drew on a common knowledge of such performed speech of the past. Its origins in popular masking meant that audience and actors were closely inter-fused.¹¹⁶ From the late sixteenth century noble households

began to patronise comedies to be performed in palace salons during Carnival. Thus the street theatre traditions of the *commedia dell'arte* produced an aristocratic equivalent. It was one into which the *Fountain of the Four Rivers* was immediately drawn, in the *intermezzi* of Meli's comedy of 1652. It was also one in which Bernini participated as playwright, director and actor, from the 1630s on.

Like the interweaving of high and low cultures in the realm of Carnival comedy, Pasquino too participated in this interplay of performance genres. It is signal that his satirical style quickly passed into the comedies and operas of the elite, where he became a macaronic voice, like the masks adopted from the *commedia* characters. The ready interchange is revealing. These different manifestations of a shared comedic culture suggest that Pasquino's voice was, from its inception, shaped by the dialogic conventions of the *commedia* masks, as it, in turn, shaped them. Like the *commedia* characters, Pasquino too moved between the palace and the piazza, along channels of transmission constituted within a 'contact zone' of high and low comedic forms. Much of the time Pasquino spoke in Latin, his commentary often revealing an insider's knowledge of intrigue at the papal court. But as with the masks of the *commedia*, the folkloric Pasquino's social position was that of the voice of the *popolo*, his humour piqued by papal excess of all kinds. Response was also bivalent. While some papacies sought to suppress Pasquino, even conjecturing throwing his ancient body into the Tiber, other popes attempted to co-opt him. His history, like the early modern festival and the Carnival comedy, was caught up in broader cross-currents of historical change, in which cultural forms migrated across the social spectrum to be reread, reinvented, remade. And the re-enactments of Bernini's new public monuments, too, may be situated within these 'crossed histories' of cultural transformation. Bernini's *Fountain of the Four Rivers* produced vivid exchange between the poets of the pope and those of the piazza because it occupied this space of reinvention. The river gods with their attributes of difference – silver coins and a pearl in the ear for Rio; or a pole to judge the deep waters of the Ganges for its god – were immediately transposed as live actors into the sung *intermezzi* of Meli's palace comedy; conversely the actors and effigies of festival floats and scenographies, often also singing, were surely a key source of the river gods' derivation. If the gestures of Bernini's river gods may be read as a figurative language of religious awe, yet their rhetorical poses made them quickly assimilable into oral comedic traditions like those of the *commedia* masks. As in the *commedia*, where gesture was central to the play of social types, popular satiric translations turned around the reinvention of gesture. St Eugenia's figuration of sincerity became the market crier's call for the price of meat; Rio's gesture of religious *apokopein* was comically reinvented as one of fear at the prospect of Borromini's cupola falling.

* * *

To turn once again to the papal *possesso* of 1644, for the rituals of his inauguration Innocent asked that Pasquino don a costume of Neptune, which was apparently designed by Bernini.¹¹⁷ In so doing Innocent harked back to an earlier Renaissance version of Pasquino, as intimated in Antoine Lafréry's print of the sculpture (see fig. 88). Lafréry depicts Pasquino without arms, or legs beyond the knee, yet the surfaces

of the torso and face are presented as pristine in condition. Although the verse inscribed on the pedestal speaks of Pasquino's mutilation as the result of blows from those whose reputation he sullied, yet the print contradicts this. Moreover, it represents Pasquino with a second torso fragment, broken at the knees and the chest. This surely alludes to a sixteenth-century literary game about Pasquino's classical identity. The sculpture was variously identified as a narrative figure grouped with another, now lost – either Hercules fighting a centaur, or Ajax with the body of Achilles. From the early years of the sixteenth century Pasquino had been the focal point of an annual poetry festival orchestrated by the canons and novitiates of San Lorenzo in Damaso. Each year Pasquino's ruined torso was temporarily 'restored', gaining *papier-mâché* limbs and facial features and a costume, generally mythological. Like permanent restorations of ancient sculptures in this period, which have aptly been termed reinventions because they endowed nameless fragments with names, attributes, and newly constructed identities, Pasquino briefly 'became' Neptune or Janus.¹¹⁸ The chosen disguise always related to current events of the preceding year and set the theme for that year's poetry competition. Submitted epigrams were pasted to Pasquino's socle and base and to the surrounding space some two to three hours beforehand, and then recited as a performance at the culmination of a procession that terminated in the square. Epigrammatic comment was humorous, but generally celebratory of papal policy. The palace walls behind Pasquino were often swathed in scenographic draperies or painted backdrops, turning the square into a 'theatre' in which the poets and a costumed Pasquino performed.¹¹⁹

During much of the early modern period, Pasquino sustained these dual identities. Since the 1530s he had maintained his reinvention as spokesman of protest, this identity stable like that of a long-familiar *commedia* mask, though his lines changed constantly in keeping with current events. At the same time the poetry festival continued, if not annually, then intermittently. The epigrams were written and performed in the name of his disguise that year. Here Pasquino was an actor, undertaking different roles. Pasquino's costumes and backdrops were increasingly elaborate and were frequently undertaken by artists, including, as for Innocent's *possesso*, Bernini.

Both Pasquino's popular and his erudite mask depended on a capacity for performance. And in both instances this was played out in the public sphere. Both his voices form part of the rich terrain of the history of Rome's public spaces – its streets, squares, buildings and monuments, but also the processions, rituals and festivals that took place within them, as well as the rhythms of the city's quotidian life. Pasquino participated in all of these. And his two voices provide a parallel to the two 'theatres' of public space, as in Piazza Navona: that of the markets and fairs with their criers and street theatres; and that of monumental sculptured fountains to be viewed from palace and carriage windows, and eliciting learned interpretation from the likes of Kircher. Bernini's Carnival play of *The Two Theatres* of 1637 opened and closed with the conceit of a fictive audience on the far side of the playhouse, embodying that hallmark of early modern theatre, the play within a play.¹²⁰ Similarly, papal re-urbanisation brought to life two 'theatres' in the city's public spaces, one of which enacted the official readings of Rome's new monuments, while the other played out otherwise silenced protest. Yet the voices of high and low cultures, papacy and protest, public and private, were

densely interwoven, even interdependent. If Bernini worked for the popes yet he sought also to epitomise the voice of a 'romano'. In fact, Bernini himself professed outright admiration for Pasquino; according to his diarists and biographers, 'Bernini was the first in Rome to place the Pasquin highest.'¹²¹ And both cultures, civic and papal, may be drawn together in their capacity for enactment. Both used Italy's rich history of performance genres to act out, through sculptural mouthpieces, the conflict of cultures that attended the political and urban innovations of papal absolutism.

The Performance of Practice

In 1632 Bernini carved two marble busts, slightly larger than life size, of his close friend and patron, Cardinal Scipione Borghese (figs 91 and 92). The biographers' accounts of their making dwell especially on Bernini's care in presenting his work to Scipione and his court.¹ While there are slight variations in the sources, the main point is the same: in the final stages of work on the first bust a marked flaw in the marble became evident across the front of the brow. In order not to disappoint his patron Bernini carved a replacement from a new block in secret and at great speed – Baldinucci says in fifteen nights, Domenico Bernini in an even more astonishing three. Before showing his completed portrait to Scipione, Bernini covered the second bust with a cloth, revealing it only after the presentation of the blemished first version. This skilfully orchestrated surprise highlighted Bernini's virtuosity in a way that straightforward replacement could not have done. It was moreover perfectly attuned to the 'calculated spontaneity' of early modern court culture.²

The sources tell many such stories about Bernini's artfully performed but apparently spontaneous presentation of his work.³ If these anecdotes illustrate Bernini's concern with staging the reception of the finished work, the same sources also have much to tell about Bernini's display of his artistic practice. Just as Bernini orchestrated the presentation of his finished projects, he also understood his artistic process as a type of cultural performance. From the sources we may thus glean details concerning Bernini's conduct of his artistic practice.⁴

Bernini's Studio

As with any artist, workshop traditions, technological developments and economic circumstances played their part in shaping Bernini's working methods. There is a considerable amount of scholarship concerned with how Bernini went about his work on a 'practical' level: the drawings and clay models that remain as material witness to his working processes;⁵ and the high degree of delegation to assistants that took place within Bernini's large and busy enterprise – what Jennifer Montagu has so aptly named 'the industry of art'.⁶ Scholars have also turned their attention to what may broadly be termed Bernini's 'theories' of art, following Rudolf Preimesberger's seminal article of 1985, which revised an earlier view of the artist as uninterested in questions of theory.⁷ Bernini conducted an academy for teaching, in which he shared his artistic precepts, as the sources record, throughout the 1630s and probably beyond.⁸ While I make extensive use of these various strands of scholarship, this chapter takes a different path. It examines stories told in letters, diaries and biographies of the artist, about how Bernini conducted his work in cultural as well as material and intellectual terms. There is a special emphasis on busts,⁹ because portraits generally required sittings (or at least extensive correspondence with a distant patron), and so dialogue

between artist and patron about the progress of the work. It focuses on Bernini's bust of Louis XIV (fig. 93), executed on his trip to France in 1665, because of the exceptional wealth of source material regarding its production, above all the almost daily account of its making by the artist's chaperone and translator in Paris, Paul Fréart de Chantelou.¹⁰

The scholarly literature on Bernini has traditionally tended to treat the Paris sojourn separately from the rest of the artist's biography.¹¹ My endeavour here is, instead, to look for common threads in the social characteristics of Bernini's working practice across his career. It is true that the circumstances under which Bernini worked in Paris were different from those in Rome and that the sources available to us for the two cities are not equivalent. It is also the case that Bernini's practice must have varied from one commission to another, depending on myriad determining circumstances, and that the social conditions of Bernini's practice changed and developed over the course of his long and illustrious career. Yet through the endless particularities of individual projects and sources, differences of genre, and changes over time, it remains useful to pursue the question of his practice in overarching terms to see what it too can yield.

To open up the study of Bernini's practice to a cultural analysis, I draw together two avenues of enquiry more usually kept apart – that of artistic production, and that of art's reception. To bring them together allows for a consideration of the cultural expectations within which Bernini worked, and how these might have shaped the objects he produced. The context of reception, then, becomes the medium – in a cultural sense – out of which Bernini fabricated his art.¹² His portraits took their form through a dense web of conventions and expectations that clustered and jostled against each other throughout their making, from inherited studio traditions to the viewing habits of Bernini's patronage milieu, and the many intellectual, social and cultural worlds that adjoined them. Portraiture required a particularly deep working of the threshold between making and viewing, as artist and patron came together in sittings throughout its progress. The portrait is, therefore, an object quintessentially constructed out of a series of exchanges, its very fabric a site of negotiation. Of few portraits is this more true than Bernini's bust of Louis XIV, born of a rich interplay of cultural politics and artistic languages. And few are better documented as to the social characteristics of their production, thanks to Chantelou's account of this portrait's making.

* * *

The cultural space for Bernini's sculptures, around which this chapter turns, is that of the artist's 'studio'. In fact this term is problematic for the early modern period, both philologically and sociologically. As Christopher S. Wood has argued, the linguistic analogy with the scholar's private place of study that the term connotes is not a perfect fit¹³ – among other things, it neglects the collaborative nature of artistic labour that Montagu has emphasised. Anthony Hughes, Peter Lukehart, and Michael Cole and Mary Pardo have variously sketched out shifts in the meaning of the word, and historical differences in artists' working spaces.¹⁴ Svetlana Alpers's work on the social construction of the studio links the artist's working environment to a series of other, competing cultural loci – the museum, the laboratory and, most importantly for this

study, the theatre.¹⁵ Her examination of Rembrandt's practice is seminal in its analysis of paint handling as a 'performance' of artistic authorship, and in its consideration of the 'theatrical' role of the model in the studio. Her account of the artist's relationship with his models, however, is of a privatised, individual form of theatre.

Mine is a different conception of the 'theatrical' studio, although artistic practice and the relationship with the model remain central to my account. Focus on the portrait form necessarily raises other issues, for attention to the model in this case entails also a consideration of the patron. My analysis of Bernini playing the role of artist in his studio thus includes a consideration of the patron within this cultural space. In his case, as for Velázquez, the patronage group is that of the court. It would seem, in general, that the early modern artist's place of work might encompass many functions – study, manufactory, office, shop, art academy for the training of apprentices and social space for the reception of courtly patrons. It is this convergence of the artist's studio with the court that distinguishes Bernini's modes of artistic performance from those of Alpers's Rembrandt. This chapter studies the implications of Bernini working not only for, but at and among the court, for the art that he produced.

To consider the changing face of artistic practice within a court culture depends on an analytical understanding of the early modern court as a social institution, itself subject to the ongoing dynamics of historical flux. As the attendant, extensive scholarly literature demonstrates the genesis of the early modern court as a social field was protean and elusive.¹⁶ In its great growth in size and grandeur from its medieval precedents, the court as an institution was to become the pre-eminent patron of cultural innovation and production in Europe, viewing an artist at work, such as Bernini, alongside the performances of singers, actors, poets, scientists and philosophers, as well as ambassadors, nobles, courtiers and household retainers. Bernini worked in their company as a salaried office holder of both the papal and (for a time) the French court.¹⁷ The implications of this presence for a court artist were to make his artistic labour into a form of noble entertainment, conducted within a social skein of aristocratic mores. The consequences for both the products and the processes of his work were surely great.

A studio populated by courtly visitors, such as Bernini's, shaped artistic practice in several overlapping ways. A court artist conducted his work as part of the overall life of the court, with all its social events, cultural entertainments, political imperatives, exits and entrances. Thus the artist's work became a kind of court performance, with consequences for the manner of its execution. To this end let us track those studio conversations concerned with Bernini's art-making in general, and with the specific work in progress, to consider the impact of this discursive criticism on the formation of an artwork. There is considerable evidence of other types of performed activities that took place in his studio, from recitals of verse and song staged by friends and visitors to plays put on by Bernini and his workshop assistants. All of these genres of performance coexisted and interfused with forms of 'acting' that served directly in the production of works of art. 'Performances' of expression, *affetti* and choreographed narrative groupings by the artist, his models, his students and his guests were clearly integral to early modern artistic process. Bernini's means of finding his art's forms and configuring poses drew deeply on the cultures of performance within which he worked, eliding the role of the artist's model with that of an 'actor'. Bernini's

‘studio’ was not, then, a place of retreat into private study, but a charged cultural space reticulated by a complexity of social relations.

The major sources on Bernini – diarists and biographers – provide us with a wealth of information on what we may term the social characteristics of his artistic practice. Most of all, they give a detailed picture of the studio as a site of princely patronage relations. They all relate insistently that Bernini’s studio was frequented by ‘not only the flower of the Roman nobility, but that of all of Europe. No sovereign, knight, or man of renown who came to Rome failed to ask to visit Bernini, to admire the work.’¹⁸ Letters and *avvisi* from Rome provide further details of these kinds of visit, and the social roles of the studio emerge forcefully from the Paris sources, particularly Chantelou’s diary, which provides not only the names of Bernini’s visitors but also details of their conversations and related activities. Otto Sperling’s well-known account of visiting Rubens’s studio describes him painting while entertaining guests and listening to a recitation of Tacitus.¹⁹ There is every indication that Rubens expected visitors to watch him paint, too, as a form of entertainment.²⁰ Scholars have surmised that Bernini’s studio also encompassed this range of cultural activity, though this has not been explored.²¹ It is therefore useful to begin by appraising the social networks within which Bernini worked, before turning to consider the interplay between them and the conduct of his art.

An analysis of the working spaces in Bernini’s house rewards this enquiry, for their layout has much to tell about the social structure of his practice. He remained in his parents’ house near Santa Maria Maggiore until the early 1630s; inventories describe the house as having three floors, a garden, and *botteghe* – workshops – on the ground floor. The family then moved next to St Peter’s, where Bernini was much employed at the time.²² In 1643 Bernini then acquired his own house in via della Mercede, also detailed in inventories. His son Domenico describes it as a hybrid – part palazzo, part atelier – reflecting the increasing specialisation of labour in early modern studios, like those of his contemporaries Pietro da Cortona and Rubens.²³ These sources tell us that he had a studio, where he worked marble, in a ground-floor room that allowed easy passage of stones and sculptures to the street. Above was a reception space for visitors and a *studiolo*, or library, but also a gallery with rooftop lighting.

The gallery functioned as a space in which to develop new projects; Bernini apparently drew in charcoal on the walls as ideas came to him.²⁴ But it was also, along with the reception room, a key space for visitors. Here guests viewed working studies for his portraits as well as oil sketches and medals, which Bernini had designed to form an ‘exhibition’ of his illustrious commissions and collaborations with other artists and famous patrons. By Bernini’s death, Urban VIII, the brothers Francesco, Taddeo and Antonio Barberini, Cardinal Richelieu, Charles I of England, Francesco I d’Este, Innocent X, Alexander VII and Clement IX populated the studio through their effigies.²⁵ Nicodemus Tessin, who visited the house during his time in Rome, described seeing drawings of ‘various portraits of cardinals by his hand’, as well as two large porphyry busts.²⁶ Joachim von Sandrart, painter and art historian, relates that Bernini showed him twenty-two models for his St Longinus, from which we may glean the impression of a studio lined with shelves of preparatory *modelli*.²⁷ Recently completed works awaiting collection were also on display for visitors. Famously, in the case of the portrait bust for his early patron Monsignor Pedro de Foix Montoya, probably intended for his tomb in the church of San Giacomo degli Spagnoli, the patron

preferred to leave it in Bernini's studio for some time after having paid for it. Because of Bernini's large number of regular visitors, Montoya apparently felt that there it more readily attracted favourable attention from cardinals, prelates and ambassadors than it would in a public church.²⁸ While there were no 'works for sale' as such in Bernini's studio, the display of objects within the house was nonetheless instrumental in procuring patronage. Domenico tells us that while Bernini was working on his early *Martyrdom of St Lawrence*, Scipione Borghese came to the family house twice to view it, along with innumerable others, such was its renown. Among these visitors was Leone Strozzi, who so loved the *St Lawrence* that he bought it for his villa.²⁹

More commonly, a visit to the studio must have nurtured the desire to be among Bernini's patrons. Bernini used his house to exhibit not only the working models of portraits of his famous clientele but also the noble gifts he received from them.³⁰ The sources proudly document these gifts, such as the ring Charles I took from his own finger to thank Bernini for his portrait (now destroyed), saying: 'Crown the hand that makes such beautiful work.'³¹ Across his career, Bernini made presentation drawings to give to his patrons in exchange for jewels, patronage and other tokens of esteem, which they presented to him.³² The display of these objects, like the house itself, clearly referenced Bernini's status both as artist and as confidant of kings.

It must be acknowledged that Bernini often worked for patrons abroad who never entered his studio, particularly princes of foreign courts, as was initially the case with his work for the French. In these instances the progress of the work was discussed by means of correspondence and it was the princes' agents who populated Bernini's studio to observe the work under way. In general the early modern artist's working space was often a moveable one. Fountains and architectural projects, of course, meant working on site; bronze casting involved long hours at a foundry; relief sculpture had to be fitted on location; while chapel decoration required the setting up of a workspace *in situ*. Beyond these obvious examples, Bernini's *modus operandi* with his patrons often involved repeated visits to them, in which work was discussed, altered and progressed, to the extent that much of the preparatory work for a project can be said to have taken place in their houses rather than his. This is evident, for example, in Alexander VII's diary. The entries are mostly brief and literal; nonetheless, some social context can be discerned. Bernini frequently brought models or drawings of what he was working on to the pope for discussion and approval, and for general viewing in the pope's gallery.³³ This must also have been the case with other patrons such as Queen Christina of Sweden, even if there is regrettably no diarist's record of it.³⁴ Thus Bernini undertook a fair portion of his work in the palaces of his patrons. In this sense his practice in Rome approximated, to a significant degree, the conduct of his work at the Louvre in Paris.

Portraits, in particular, often required the artist's presence in the home of the patron because of the sittings they undertook together. Conducting a sitting required the artist to work both before, and with, his patron, and usually with others in attendance. Thus the portrait came about embedded within the performance of these social relationships, as Bernini and his biographers clearly understood. Indeed, it became an ideal of princely portraiture in the period that it embody a relationship between the sovereign sitter and the ennobled artist, cast in terms of intimacy, even friendship.³⁵ Baldinucci, for example, recounts how Bernini gained the love of Gregory XV and of his nephew through his portraits of the pope, who invited him to dine in order to

enjoy his conversation, and made him knight of the Order of Christ. Again, Alexander VII's diary gives a picture of the close, often daily, social interaction involved in executing a papal portrait: the audiences, the conversations, the visits and the sittings. '1 July – Bernini made a design for our portrait bust; 5 July – Cav. Bernini came and with a pencil noted more things for our portrait to be made in marble and first in wax; 15 July – Bernini returned to draw us; 19 August – Camillo and his son were with us to view the gallery with Bernini, who showed our portrait in wax; 2 October – today Cav. Bernini brought the large marble of our portrait, which was seen by many.'³⁶ Early on in the sittings for the Louis XIV bust, Mattia de' Rossi relates an incident, corroborated by Domenico, which illustrates well the intimate access to a sovereign that portraiture might permit the artist. According to French fashion, the king wore his hair over his forehead, which Bernini found obscured his study of the king's face. He approached the king, asking for a comb, and gently adjusted the hair with his own hands in order to reveal the brow.³⁷ The story epitomises the opportunities of a court portraitist to rise to the greatly coveted position of physical contact with the sovereign, as Bernini surely knew. Undertaken before large numbers of courtiers, Bernini must have seen it as a means of asserting the primacy of his position among them by means of his art.

Of course, portraitists had always enjoyed social access to their patrons through the sittings they undertook together, and used them to procure their advancement.³⁸ My focus here extends beyond the portrait form, however, to the conduct of Bernini's practice more generally. In a sense Bernini extended the sociability of court portraiture to his practice for all genres of art. Such a formulation of the court artist's studio as a noble social space, and the working process as a court spectacle, made figures such as Bernini, Velázquez and Rubens among the most select and sought-after 'artist-performers' within princely circles. Scattered comments in the sources pertaining to Bernini confirm this picture of the conduct of his practice. From them we glean a further sense of the artist's work as a form of court *divertissement* for an audience. The papal nuncio in Paris, Carlo Roberti de' Vittori, for example, described the success of one such 'event': 'On Tuesday at S. Germain, Bernini drew the king, to great applause.'³⁹ On another occasion Chantelou described a group of courtiers standing at the door of the room to watch, like a theatre audience, as Bernini worked at the king's likeness.⁴⁰

That Bernini habitually worked before large audiences is amply confirmed by the sources for both Paris and Rome. People came to his studio because it became a social space of distinction. In Paris, Bernini frequently worked with some forty to fifty people in attendance – members of the French royal family and their retinues, as well as visitors of note such as Pierre Corneille and Charles Le Brun; and in Italy, popes, cardinals, the papal court, ambassadors, visiting princes and their escorts, other artists and intellectuals from across Europe, and Rome's own leading patrons of the arts came to the studio regularly. Domenico tells us that, in Paris, Cardinal Antonio Barberini and the apostolic nuncio, Monsignor Carlo Roberti de' Vittori, were continually with Bernini, while in Rome, according to the sources, he enjoyed periods in which Scipione Borghese and Maffeo Barberini did him the honour of their constant presence and friendship.⁴¹ Sadly the Roman sources do not permit us the close daily knowledge of Bernini's visitors that Chantelou documents; nonetheless, the biographers do record the visits of the most illustrious. Baldinucci tells us that Bernini received princes and

cardinals constantly, who were drawn by the desire to see him work, adding another future pope, Fabio Chigi, and Rinaldo d'Este.⁴² In addition, recent research has documented the artist's close ties with cardinals Sforza Pallavicino and Decio Azzolini, and the Duke of Bracciano, Paolo Giordano Orsini.⁴³ Scholars have noted, for example, individual visitors such as the Swedish royal architect Count Nicodemus Tessin, the court poet and cultural advisor Geminiano Poggi, and Bernini's close friend the court poet and *metteur-en-scène* Lelio Guidiccioni.⁴⁴ It was under Urban VIII and, above all, under Alexander VII that Bernini began to receive rulers and princes in his working space. Urban VIII visited Bernini on his sickbed, on one occasion, also sending his cardinal nephews and his personal physician to attend the artist. Alexander VII visited Bernini several times, at his house and at the Vatican foundry, when Bernini was working on the figures for the *Cathedra Petri*. On the first occasion Bernini gave the pope a tour of the works on display room by room.⁴⁵ Bernini's great patron Queen Christina visited him at home on a number of occasions; and Clement IX also came to the house. Each arrived with a retinue of cardinals or courtiers as well as guards. While these were at the level of state visits, we can surmise that his less eminent patrons, too, came to the studio to see their work progress, to converse with the artist, to see other works on display, to meet with others there, and above all to witness the cultural act of the artist at work.

In Paris, unquestionably, many came to see the king. Again, Chantelou's diary offers an exceptionally detailed account of social exchange in the studio, representing Bernini at work amid a multiplicity of other conversations, arrivals and departures. To give a flavour of this, in one sitting, for example, on 19 July 1665, in the king's study at Saint-Germain, Bernini was drawing Louis alongside discussion of his plans for the renovation of the Louvre (never executed). As Bernini began work the court jester came in to speak with the king. The queen then entered and remained to watch while Bernini was drawing on his knees on the floor, presumably to capture the king from below. As the Duc de Nouailles, M. de Beringhen and the Duchesse de Montausier arrived, the king asked Chantelou to show them Bernini's drawings for the Louvre.⁴⁶ On the 21 August, as Bernini worked on the marble in the studio, the Duc de Créqui and the Maréchal de La Ferté came to meet him and invite him to dinner. At that moment the king arrived, accompanied by thirty or forty people. While the king talked a great deal with the Maréchal de La Ferté, Bernini never stopped working. Finally Pierre Mignard's brother, Nicolas, came in, sent by Colbert to take the king's measurements for a full-length portrait to be sent abroad.

Bernini's paramount success in the circle of popes and princes surely owed as much to his ability to conduct his work through the social conventions of elite conversation as to his fecund artistry. His son Domenico tells us that the Ludovisi invited Bernini to dine with them for his 'virtuoso discourse'; Cardinal Chigi urged Bernini to return from Paris because 'we are deprived of your conversation'; and a famous letter by Fulvio Testi describes delightful conversation – 'dolcissima, gustosissima e virtuosissima' – with Bernini, praising his erudite wit.⁴⁷ A commonplace of the extensive literature on court society is germane to Bernini's finesse with his princely patrons: the skill of manipulating an increasingly elaborate court protocol with a deft moment of informality to achieve the sought-after designation of intimate and virtuoso. Again, the story of Bernini rearranging Louis's hair epitomises this; it perfectly illustrates the dexterous informality of his manner with his patrons. Bernini mixed the gesture with

flattery, declaring: ‘Your Majesty is a king, who can show his brow to all the world.’⁴⁸ Often humour was Bernini’s means of forging bonds of intimacy with his patrons, which is why his biographers tirelessly relay to the reader the wit of his famous aphorisms.⁴⁹

Of course, there were moments in which Bernini’s studio was not open to visitors. Chantelou tells us that Bernini asked him to admit no one to see the bust on the day on which he planned to have *Louis XIV* turned over in order to mount it on a socle⁵⁰ – clearly, there were studio activities that were not suitable for viewing. And when the French court returned from Saint-Germain to the Louvre, where he was working at the time, Bernini was concerned that the constant stream of visitors would impede his work. In Rome, where he lived in his own house rather than in court lodgings, he retained greater control, letting it be known that he was happy to receive visitors as long as he was apprised beforehand. Presumably in this way he avoided spectatorship of unsuitable activities such as turning over busts. His son confirms this control in a passage that, at the same time, testifies to the number of visitors usually present in Bernini’s studio: ‘The Cavalier’s house received continually the most noteworthy persons in Rome, who, either moved by admiration for his work, or desirous to engage in virtuoso conversation with him, came constantly: for this reason it was at times necessary to refuse.’⁵¹

The Artist at Court

An artist’s success at court, as Bernini’s career perfectly illustrates, depended on an exceptional versatility, and an ability to lend ingenuity to any project or occasion that served the prince’s social and political ends.⁵² This meant that Bernini, a sculptor by trade, served on the one hand as architect, working on constructions as vast as the colonnade for St Peter’s, and on the other hand designing confectionery dinner table decorations, carriage finials, stage sets, or triumphal entries for visiting sovereigns. Putting on court entertainments often meant working within very tight time frames, particularly in the preparation of ephemeral decorations for social and ritual events. According to the conventions of aristocratic dissimulation, these events were staged as if they were entirely spontaneous. Artfully worked sets appeared at the prince’s whim, their almost ‘magical’ apparition acting as proof of his innate powers of command. From this derived the great store set by a rapid execution, which court cultures came to see as a mark of artistic genius – surely the issue that led Bernini’s biographer son to claim that he could sculpt a bust in three nights. Above all it required the artist–performer to present his work as one of great technical difficulty achieved with a seeming ease and grace.

Bernini and his biographers represented his artistic accomplishment from his earliest years as paradigmatic of this trope – effortless, innate, yet demonstrating a technical virtuosity in the art of illusion beyond the comprehension of his viewers – in short, a form of courtly dissimulation to mirror that of his prince’s power. According to Bernini’s biographers he first attracted papal attention at the age of ten for a head he had carved. When presented to Pope Paul V, he was asked to draw a head of St Paul. The young artist executed a head swiftly and masterfully to the wondering delight of the pontiff – the earliest example of Bernini ‘performing’ his art-making for a courtly

audience.⁵³ An artist's success in this culture depended on an ability to surprise the audience with the unexpected. This required a carefully planned but seemingly spontaneous, 'hidden' yet seen, artistry. To accomplish this Bernini presented his work as a courtly paradox, making his audience simultaneously aware of the immense *difficoltà* of his art, particularly in terms of its technical mastery, and of the great *facilità* with which he worked, in terms of both speed and finesse. Descriptions of the conduct of his practice in the studio revolve around the interplay of these poles, to applaud not only the artist's inventive ingenuity but also his fluent ease of execution. It is this paradox between the artful and the apparently innate that Bernini articulated to another visitor in Paris, the Abbé Jacques Carpentier de Marigny. In response to Marigny's praise for the seeming ease with which he conducted his practice, Bernini replied, quoting Michelangelo, 'I shit blood while I work.'⁵⁴

Yet, as Marigny noted, Bernini undertook the greatest challenges of his work making conversation all the while, presenting his artistry as a stunning virtuosity, performed with an equal grace. Lelio Guidiccioni, a constant visitor and intimate to the sculptor from his earliest years, describes Bernini as 'always making decorous conversation on current events, even while with his hands he [worked] far away from the discussion . . . handling the model . . . like one playing the harp'. Guidiccioni further marvelled at the range of endeavour the artist encompassed: with *facilità*, with *prestezza*, without hesitation, making many contrary motions with singular ease, 'modelling with [your] fingers . . . marking the marble with charcoal in a hundred places, striking the marble with a mallet in a hundred others. . . . [Y]ou hold in your fingertips the images . . . to be rendered in marble; or you find the forms magically hidden within the marble.'⁵⁵

Bernini's artistic *facilità* and accompanying ready wit were famously borne out by a type of drawing he occasionally executed in court circles, his caricatures (fig. 94).⁵⁶ The biographers tell us that 'he made many [caricatures] . . . delighting in drawing princes and illustrious personages, for the pleasure they derived from looking and recognising themselves and others, all the while admiring the artist's ingenuity'; and that 'such personages delighted in amusing themselves with [Bernini] with this pastime, even when [the caricatures were] of their own faces, showing the drawings to others of their rank'.⁵⁷ The Duke of Bracciano, of whom Bernini made a portrait, recalled the artist making caricatures of guests at his villa.⁵⁸ And Chantelou relates an incident that perfectly illustrates the social context in which Bernini's caricatures arose: during a sitting with the king, 'someone having mentioned a caricature, the Cavaliere said he had made one of the Abbé Buti, and he had a look for it so as to show it to His Majesty, but as he did not find it, he asked for a pencil and paper and drew another with a couple of strokes in front of the king, who studied it with much amusement and then passed it to Monsieur and the others who had come into the room and to those who stood by the doorway'.⁵⁹ Mixing flattery with wit, Bernini would seem to have used his rapidly executed caricatures to perform the role of artist in humorous vein.⁶⁰ The caricature embodied the requisite skills of the court artist – to work with facility in a social context, and to entertain his audience with a 'sketch', a parallel to the informal and improvised performances that characterised so much court entertainment.

At the same time Bernini did occasionally permit, indeed invite, a courtly perception of the manual toil of his work. Perhaps the most moving story told by the biographers concerning Bernini's 'performance' of the role of artist for a court audience

concerns one of Queen Christina's visits to his studio, in 1663. According to the mores of court society, this was in theory impromptu. Etiquette therefore ensured that it did not become a state visit but remained on a less formal, seemingly more spontaneous footing. Doubtless to show his appreciation of this nicety, Bernini received her and her numerous court in his sculptor's smock, because this was the garment of the artist at work. And she, recognising the reference, made a point of touching the smock with her own hands to show her esteem for art. In response to an unknown who had counselled him to change beforehand Bernini replied that 'he had no habit more decorous in which to receive a Queen, who wishes to visit a virtuoso, than that coarse, rough cloth proper to his virtue'.⁶¹ The story is poignant in its identification of Bernini's artistic virtue with his physical labour, and in his appeal to his patron's finer understanding.⁶² Through this he succeeded in making even the harshest form of artistic toil, that of the sculptor's encounter with hard stone and marble dust, into a noble performance, elevating the clothes of his trade into a courtier's costume. It is the strongest affirmation that the work of an artist, in all its manifestations, had become the proper object of a princely audience, and the stuff of noble virtue.

Equally, although Bernini sometimes entertained his visitors with conversation while he worked, he was also renowned for his intense absorption in his work, which visitors were permitted to witness but not to interrupt. At such times his assistants and even close friends received his guests, while he continued working as if in a 'trance'. Baldinucci tells us that 'cardinals and princes who came to watch him work would see themselves in without a word, so as not to distract him, and take their leave just as quietly for the same reason'.⁶³ Bernini's son tells us they went to see him face to face to note his actions and to see the work unfold.⁶⁴ Bernini's labour became a cultural performance viewed by a courtly audience intent on watching his thought processes through the visible actions of his hands upon the marble. Above all, they came to see Bernini render stone into effigy, the dexterous chipping and shedding of marble to forge art's illusions, endowing them with the semblance of presence. Baldinucci and Domenico both describe the artist at work as 'so absorbed that he appeared ecstatic, in the act of . . . bringing stone to life'.⁶⁵ Bernini's visitors came to see the artist's magical transformation of marble into 'life'.

Studio Conversation

Sources on Bernini provide much detail about not only who visited him at work but also the types of discussion and interaction the artist conducted with his guests. Through the subject matter of Bernini's recorded studio conversations we may understand how their substance, as well as their form, fed into his artistic process. The sources that underpin this study – above all letters, biographies and diaries – are themselves many-layered, 'conversational' texts, variegated by the broader strata of interaction between the artist and his different interlocutors.⁶⁶ Nonetheless, the material stands as evidence of the range of cultural fields that entered into the artist's work in progress. Much of the conversation must have centred around formalities with distinguished guests and patrons, which I have argued played their part in the social construction of Bernini's work as an aristocratic spectacle. Much that went completely unrecorded must have taken place between Bernini and his assistants concerning

practical exigencies. But much of what is noted in the sources, no doubt because of its intrinsic interest to its authors and intended readers, deals in various ways with the making and viewing of art, ranging from the pithiest of procedural observations to finely nuanced discussions of judgement and the training of the eye.

In his daily account of Bernini's activities in Paris, Chantelou also gives us details of the artist's encounters with other works of art, on visits to churches, royal palaces and private collectors, frequently accompanied by his studio assistants. What Chantelou reports of Bernini's critical commentary matches closely with less detailed evidence of his activities as a connoisseur, in which capacity he often gave opinions on works of art to friends and patrons, both in Paris and in Rome.⁶⁷ Both genres reflect a form of criticism grounded in the experience of practice, like the corrective remarks Bernini made to assistants and students working under his direction. For example, Bernini advised the Pamphili concerning a gift of paintings for Louis XIV, offering his comments on the works as to attribution and quality. On a purported Raphael, Bernini pointed to a hand, remarking 'You can always tell from the painting of these parts whether a picture is original or not. This could never have been painted by Raphael; it must be Giulio Romano.'⁶⁸ On viewing Chantelou's *Eucharist* by Poussin, Bernini turned to his assistants, his son Paolo and Mattia de' Rossi, instructing them as to how to look: 'point[ing] out the beauty of the heads, one after the other, and the harmony of the light'.⁶⁹ Thus his critical acumen as a connoisseur and judge of art merged with his roles as teacher and director of a large workshop.

Indeed, discussion in Bernini's studio seems to have revolved around what we may term teaching precepts, constructed in art-theoretical terms yet always tinged by the demands of process. Evidently this took place as Bernini and his studio assistants worked, the topics doubtless prompted by the specifics at hand; at the same time such discussion was surely instrumental to their practice. The Italian sources are detailed in their account of what must have been Bernini's maxims for his students, which centre around the craft of his art, the technical means of rendering illusion. Through them we see Bernini reflect on the rich and heterogeneous artistic debates to which he was heir, mediated through the imperatives of his work. He is recorded as commenting on a range of issues pertaining to artistic illusion, such as optics, that fertile interaction between faithful copying, viewing distance and the judgement of the eye; and the fashioning of the sculptor's material, stone, into the semblance of colour and texture – those practices and precepts that enabled Bernini to give marble the semblance of life.

Domenico reports Bernini's answer to the question of the *paragone*, the comparison between painting and sculpture that structured much of the critical discussion of the period and that seems to have played a fundamental role in Bernini's formulation of his art across his career. Because sculpture is an art without the advantage of colours, it must give its figures the semblance of life through the fall of light and shadow occasioned by its surface relief. To illustrate how difficult it was to forge a resemblance out of white marble, Bernini used the example of a man who whitened his face and became unrecognisable although his features remained the same.⁷⁰ It was a story he told repeatedly, and one that is sufficiently unusual within art theory of the period to merit the suggestion that it was an analogy born of practice. From his earliest years Bernini learned to work from white plaster death masks in making his virtuoso 'life-like' funerary portraits, enacting his own fable of procuring presence from a blanched

material. Domenico saw it as the crowning achievement of his father's work to have overcome the limitations of his medium, working marble 'as if it were wax' or *pasta*, 'fusing sculpture with painting'.⁷¹ The reference to a handling like *pasta*, doubtless Bernini's own, surely makes reference to sixteenth-century Venetian discussions of painted *impasto*, suggesting a further claim for sculpture to rival painting in the tradition of the *paragone*; it also heightens the craft-based associations of his practice through the domestic analogy of comparing marble to common dough. The reference to wax modelling similarly invites comparison with the realm of wax sculpture, a longstanding Florentine tradition, often used in *ex voto* portraits for its vivid powers of plastic and surface illusion, which Bernini must have known. Like death masks the *ex voto* portrait was made from a direct imprint of the sitter's face without recourse to judgement and for this reason similarly hovered on the threshold between art and craft.⁷²

Beyond the allusions to craft and to preparatory works, this likening of Bernini's handling of marble to dough and to wax above all stressed his ability to render hard stone as if it were a soft, pliant material. His French biographer, Pierre Cureau de La Chambre, similarly commemorated Bernini's artifice of illusion as that of 'softening' the marble with his scalpel, dematerialising the hardness of stone into myriad other textures, giving it here lightness, there transparency, elsewhere transforming it into flesh.⁷³ The artist's alchemy lay in two related transformations: that of softening dense marble into a seemingly malleable substance; and of using shadows and lights to 'paint' on the surface of the stone. Through the dexterous use of his chisel Bernini created a modulated relief surface that engendered a play of shadows and reflections, his sculptural means of 'painterly' illusion. Chantelou recounts Bernini's homily on this in relation to the depiction of the eyes: 'one must hollow out the marble, in this way obtaining the effect of colour and supplementing, so to speak, the art of sculpture, which cannot give colour to things'. In answer to a query from a visitor in Paris about his practice in the rendering of eyes, which perfectly illustrates his technical approach to this debate, he replied that 'he would make a tap or two . . . and the shadow of the cavity would represent the pupil of the eye' (figs 95 and 96).⁷⁴

Bernini's teaching methods in the studio have often been described as craftsmanlike and it is true that he maintained his membership of Rome's stoneworker's guild throughout his life. At the same time he conducted an academy for painting; was *principe* of the Roman art academy, the Accademia di San Luca; and through his trip to Paris sustained a longstanding relationship with the Académie Française, both lecturing to its members in France and training its sculpture students in Rome. According to the report of his lecture to the Académie, Bernini emphasised above all the importance of study after the antique in order to form an idea 'du grand et du beau'. But this study was to be wholly fused with the practice of making: materiality and imitation undertaken side by side.⁷⁵ Similarly Tessin records the artist's studio conversation on the importance of choosing good models for imitation, a prevailing trope in early modern art theory, but also a practical problem for the artist at work. Bernini urged a constant exchange between the study of nature and the canons of art, as well as an ongoing critique of developing work with others in the studio, 'making . . . sketches, drawings, of different ideas, asking the counsel of others . . . putting the ideas beside each other, to judge them, to consider'. Here again the discussion converges with the kind of art criticism Bernini practised for connoisseurial purposes, for both required

honing skills of critical judgement. Moreover Tessin recounts Bernini's critiques of the work of students, where critical skills were fully applied to the development of practice.⁷⁶ The English sculptor Nicholas Stone recorded meeting Bernini in his studio, who advised him as to copying after Raphael and antique architecture but also offered to let Stone watch him work and then work alongside him.⁷⁷ Bernini's so-called *detti* ('sayings'), as reported by his biographers, concur with this in showing that, just as his artistic intentions were shaped by the critical debates of his day, so his experience of practice mediated his interest and point of view on matters of theory.⁷⁸ The biographer of several of his students, Lione Pascoli, referred to Bernini's studio as a 'scuola', or school,⁷⁹ surely because the artist's practice included instruction in the precepts of art to his students. A further source may be brought to bear in this regard – namely the text of a dialogue between Bernini and Guidiccioni on issues of art theory, ranging from the relationship between imitation and originality to that of his sculptural illusionism. Particularly pertinent here is evidence suggesting that this dialogue was enacted by the two speakers before an audience in Bernini's studio.⁸⁰ If this was the case it is richly suggestive of the ready interplay between art-making and performance cultures in Bernini's work.

Studio Performances

The range of impromptu 'performances' that took place in Bernini's studio may be broadly encompassed under the all-important 'presentation of self' within Baroque court culture, in which Bernini played the part of the magisterial artist for his patrons, visitors and students. Within that overarching paradigm, however, we may discern distinct yet overlapping genres. These include social performance within elite conversational mores, shaped by the context of a court culture – Bernini's skill in engaging with his visitors and patrons on a range of issues from social engagements to the processes of art-making. The richness of Chantelou's diary in this regard is inestimable: it presents a vivid picture of the multiplicity of conversations surrounding and engaging Bernini as he worked. Coupled with other correspondence from Paris, the evidence from Chantelou strongly suggests a proximity between the artist's studio and that of the early modern *accademie*, social groups for intellectual exchange, loosely resembling the later emergence of salon culture. Chantelou's account of Bernini's daily activity is frequently studded with accounts of song, verse and music performed as Bernini worked, a range of informal recitals that characterised much court socialising of the period as well as its academies, and that 'accompanied' the ongoing performance of Bernini carving the king's likeness. Transposing this affinity into an Italian context, I shall argue that Bernini's studio in Rome, too, took on many of the cultural activities of Italy's burgeoning *accademie*. The extensive corpus of verse composed in praise of Bernini's work in academy circles suggests that in Rome, as in Paris, Bernini worked amid a web of recitals interspersed with conversations about his art.⁸¹ As in *accademie* dedicated to literature or science, court and city met in Bernini's studio to socialise and participate in parallel forms of conversational exchange. Indeed, Fulvio Testi's letter in praise of Bernini's accomplished conversation referred to their discussion as 'mezza accademia' – as if an academy.⁸²

Scholarly understanding of the early modern Italian academy as a cultural institution is wide-ranging because these groups themselves embraced an extensive array of forms and interests, variously devoted to scientific enquiry, natural history, archaeology, music, drama, art and literature.⁸³ The first edition of the Italian dictionary *Vocabolario della Crusca* (1612) defined the term ‘accademia’ simply as ‘an assembly of scholars’ as well as the ‘place where they gather’.⁸⁴ More specific to my purposes here, Frances Yates has noted that the core activity of most academies was improvised declamations of learned speech constructed as a social pastime, into which a dialogue on art theory such as that between Bernini and Guidiccioni may be subsumed. Academy members engaged in extempore performances of verse or wit on a given topic or theme, often from literary sources, but also deriving from the subject of a work of art.⁸⁵ Specific to Bernini, his training included recitations conducted in the studio by himself and his assistants and students, in which they declaimed monologues in a performance of character roles.⁸⁶

Concomitantly, the term ‘accademia’ was commonly used by artists of the period with reference to group meetings to draw from life, and to the drawings that these encounters produced (as well, of course, as those more formal institutions devoted to artistic instruction such as Bernini himself conducted).⁸⁷ This suggests a convergence between the act of drawing and that of improvising, between the performance of art-making and that of impromptu recital. Beyond an analysis of the social milieu of the studio, it suggests a parallel between the artist’s process, in its conceptual and physical aspects, and that of the performer. The artist’s improvised ‘performance’ of the caricature encapsulates, in witty form, this double sense of the ‘sketch’; it is also the epitome of an aristocratic *divertissement*, played out for a salon audience. I will return to this affinity between drawing and improvising, art-making and performance later; first I wish to pursue further the convergence of the *accademia* with the studio.

The Paris sources are particularly rich in detail of ‘salon’-type entertainments in Bernini’s studio, similar to those that Sperling met in his encounter with Rubens. Chantelou gives a vivid account of this. For example, on 9 September he reports that the previous evening Bernini had worked on the king’s bust by the light of torches. The nuncio arrived, followed by Mlle de Saint-Christophe, who sang some French and Italian songs. Still others came, and finally the king. Bernini conducted a lengthy conversation with Louis before the court, then others present recited madrigals in praise of the bust in Italian and in French.⁸⁸ On 20 August Mattia de’ Rossi declaimed a sonnet he had written in praise of the portrait, the artist and the sitter, which he then presented to the king, and Chantelou followed by presenting a similar poetic eulogy to the bust by Francesco Buti, a friend of Bernini’s and fellow protégé of the Barberini, who had introduced opera to the French court. Prevailed upon by Louis XIV, Chantelou then recited this verse and gave copies to the courtly audience. At this point Bernini interjected to say that Chantelou had a collection of other verses on the portrait, which they had received from Rome. These were sent for and Bernini himself read them out to the king and the company.⁸⁹ Chantelou records several other occasions on which Bernini’s friends and visitors declaimed verse composed around the subject of the bust. Their performance involved elements of prepared speech but also improvisation as members of the company ‘turned’ verse from French to Italian or vice versa.⁹⁰ Bernini’s French biographer, Cureau de La Chambre, adds a further example of improvised verse to this account, citing impromptu lines apparently by

the artist himself in response to an epigram by Buti.⁹¹ The verses revolve around a confusion of the portrait with the sitter, that most cherished trope of a culture of imitation in which the bust became a double of the king. The reputations of king, artist and portrait were multiplied by a reciprocal repetition of likeness, in which the bust was both the resemblance of Louis, and the emblem of Bernini's art:

Until now there existed nothing resembling Louis.

Thanks to Bernini, there are two of him,
the one invincible, the other inimitable.⁹²

. . . illustrious Bernini, whose chisel puts the breath of life into marble!

The genius of great Louis has become alive in this blessed stone;
his image has here imparted to the marble, the honor which belongs to him.⁹³

These verses draw on a rich history of literary citation founded in a longstanding poetic engagement with art's mimetic powers of illusion, and with portraiture's specific gift of embodying both artist and sitter. Petrarchan poetics on portraits turned on the device of portraiture as presence, and the immortalisation of both artist and sitter in the effigy. Plutarch's *Life of Alexander the Great* described the bond between the king and his artist, Apelles, in which the greatness of each was enriched by their union in art – 'the one invincible, the other inimitable'. Similarly, the author of the verse on Bernini's portrait quoted Plutarch in order to cast the king as a second Alexander, so magnifying his aura, of which Bernini's art was a mirror. Within the prevailing metaphor of the court as a stage from which to project Louis's image throughout the world, artist and poets came together to perform their eulogies to the king. Like the ongoing ceremonial rituals of state, Bernini, the bust and the recited verse they inspired were woven into the fabric of the king's 'rayonnement', players in the projection of his radiance.⁹⁴

In his one surviving play manuscript, the so-called *Impresario*, Bernini played the role of an artist, accompanied by his studio assistants cast as themselves. The play was largely set in an artist's studio. While we know nothing of its performance details, scholars have speculated that Bernini may have intended to stage it, as he did with other comedies, in his workspace at the Vatican foundry. In an ironic twist, the plot turns on ne'er-do-wells trying to gain access to the artist's studio in order to steal his ideas; yet the performance of the play would have brought an audience into Bernini's workshop to witness his inventions in progress. Moreover, they would have seen Bernini play the role of the artist in his studio in a perfect fusion of 'life' and 'art'.⁹⁵ Other sources make fleeting reference to the possibility of further comedies by Bernini set within the artist's workshop: Chantelou records two conversations with Bernini in which the sculptor made reference to comedic plots with such a setting, possibly various re-stagings of *The Impresario*, possibly independent plays. In one, a young man pretended to be deaf-mute in order to gain entry to an old master's studio to seduce his daughter. In the other, young men feigned interest in buying paintings in order to gain access to the painter's home and so his daughter.⁹⁶ Contemporary correspondence describes a further play by Bernini entitled *The Two Academies* (1635) set within two rival Neapolitan studios, one for painting, the other for sculpture, in a parody of the *paragone*. As they work on their respective pictures and statues, the pupils also put on a comedy of loves.⁹⁷ To stage these formal theatrical events the biographers relate that Bernini used his students and studio assistants as actors in his

plays. He often put on an annual production, at Carnival, which was not always performed in his studio but nonetheless used his studio staff as cast.⁹⁸ Much of the rehearsing and the production of stage sets and costumes must surely also have taken place in some part of his workshop. In these instances the realm of the theatre and that of art production converged upon the studio, the same cultural space playing host to both.⁹⁹

Further, the biographers relate Bernini's methods for rehearsing his students' dramatic skills. To show them their parts, he acted them out himself, then asking each one to play his role to ensure that they 'would give natural and lively performances. In so doing, he served as everyone's teacher and the result was that they behaved like long-time professionals.'¹⁰⁰ This method of role-playing, a lesson in dramatic expression, served Bernini not only in putting on plays but was fundamental to his artistic process too.¹⁰¹ Across his career and as part of the instruction he imparted to his students, Bernini sought out the poses, gestures, expressions and movements of his art through a process of 'enactment'. That is to say, in order to find the most evocative gestures he thrust himself bodily into these roles, making his own body into the medium by which to configure the most powerful visual signs of internal states of mind. According to the recurring, finely nuanced, theories of imitation in early modern art theory, which in turn drew on a classical literature concerned with rhetoric, these visual signs of interiority were not merely conventional, but were to be 'embodied', or made present, by playing at the threshold between 'life' and art. Through Bernini's practice of improvisation, fundamental to his process, we discern the means by which the artist realised a pragmatics of mimesis. His enacted expression became the intermediary between his observation of the world and its artistic representation, and the means by which 'lifelikeness', the leitmotif of early modern art criticism, entered into the artist's effigies. In Bernini's ceaseless quest for the semblance of animation, the seeming confusion of art with life that remained the crux of artistic accomplishment for the period, this performed entrance into the figuring of his representations was his means of charging the object with the fiction of life.¹⁰²

Performance and Practice

From the earliest stages of his career Bernini's biographers relate instances of this process of enactment in relation to specific works of art. Domenico reports that, to find the most potent visual motif for the early *Martyrdom of St Lawrence* (fig. 97), who looks to the heavens for deliverance while being burnt alive, the artist held his leg over a burning coal and studied himself in a mirror.¹⁰³ The reflexive interplay between the model's act and the artist's representation would seem to come full circle in this instance. A story that was no doubt embroidered, it is nonetheless told and retold because of its efficacy in encapsulating the purpose of Bernini's performative process. Here the actor-model is at once the artist, who moves his body into the pose of the figure he seeks to represent. Bernini pursued the fullest identification with his subject by reliving Lawrence's corporeal suffering in order first to perform and then simultaneously to observe and portray the visible signs of the saint's interior state. The mode of configuring this *tableau* into a visual idiom was the mirror, which became the artist's eye. Some ten years later, when Bernini was working on *David* and trying to dispose

the figure about to fire his shot at Goliath, Baldinucci and Domenico both relate that Cardinal Maffeo Barberini held a mirror for him so that he could study his own performance of the action. The biographers report the incident because, again, it illustrates Bernini's close friendships with his patronage group, such that a cardinal and future pope was prepared to subvert social hierarchy in his service. In terms of his artistic process, it allowed Bernini to view, and so depict, his own performance of David's intense moment of concentration, represented by a 'vigorous furrowing of the brow, a powerful fixity about the eyes' (fig. 98).¹⁰⁴ And again, during the execution of the *Louis XIV*, Chantelou relates a similar though different process for capturing the power of a live performance in visual form. Bernini, in a general discussion with his friend Buti on artistic rendition of the *affetti*, described his process for capturing bodily expressions as follows: he himself 'acted out' the pose to be depicted, asking another artist in the studio to sketch this for him.¹⁰⁵

Pressing further on the contiguity between the acting model and the lifelike object, I want now to analyse the particularities of this nexus in specific relation to portraiture. For in this genre, the model is the sitter, and therefore the 'character' to be represented, as distinct from a history painting, in which models are subsumed into their fictive roles. The portraitist's brief, as Chantelou's Bernini so fully grasped, was to capture the sitter's identity, not only through the imitation of his physiognomy but also in a configuration of pose and demeanour to express his dominant and most characteristic 'qualities', transforming the depicted body of Louis XIV into a sign of royal power.

Before moving on to discuss the Paris bust, however, let us consider two of the many portraits Bernini undertook in Rome, those of Scipione Borghese, with which the chapter opened (see figs 91 and 92). While the biographers say little about the sittings that Bernini and Scipione must have undertaken together, a letter by Guidiccioni describes the execution of these busts, as well as one of Urban VIII. Above all, Guidiccioni characterised the profundity of Bernini's observation of his sitter's appearance and character, borne of long years of friendship: 'Thus in the portrait we see [Scipione] thoughtful and joyful, sweet and majestic, spirited and grave', the portrait capturing the liveliness of the face, actions, eyes; the concordance of muscles, which here rise to a fleshy fullness, or there fall into concavity; the smile of those parts not smiling, the movement of those parts not moving.¹⁰⁶ Guidiccioni perceived Bernini's skill in conveying the complexities of his sitter's character through the infinite textural nuances of his face, the fine touches of the chisel that enliven the surface with creases and hollows that reflect light and cast shadows, the sculptor's 'colours'. Guidiccioni writes that Bernini captured 'the movement of those parts not moving', the suggestion of motion in inanimate stone conveyed through the dynamics of the pose, and the rustling animation of drapery through the liveliness of its shifting reflections. The counterpoint of the body, as the head turns in opposition to the frontal view of the shoulders, invites the viewer to move around the bust in order to meet the face, so forging an active engagement between the two that animates the work. The head turns as if to acknowledge the viewer; the parted lips and direct gaze of the eyes, too, address the viewer in seeming conversation.¹⁰⁷ Guidiccioni understood the depth of the portrait as the fruit of years of familiarity; this is borne out by Domenico, who described the close relationship between artist and sitter that the bust embodies.¹⁰⁸ Thus the bust may be said to portray friendship. The cardinal's cap makes the sitter's

social position clear, yet there is an air of lively informality wrought through the unevenly creased drapery folds and the unsparing description of the face – unaligned and deep-set eyes, beset with wrinkled and sagging skin; bulbous nose and double chin – an abundance of details that we read bit by bit and that give the portrait presence.¹⁰⁹ The direct address of the eyes indicates that it was intended to be viewed at eye level, creating a parity between the cardinal and his viewer. It seems to capture the cardinal as if in conversation with the artist who carved it, literally representing the essence of their relations. The extant drawings of Scipione tell a fuller story of the rapport between the artist and his patron–friend. Both the preparatory sketch in the Pierpont Morgan Library (fig. 99)¹¹⁰ and the caricature sketch of Scipione in the Vatican Library (see fig. 94) testify to an easy intimacy between the two men during sittings. In the former, a profile study, the details of curial dress are barely referenced. The artist’s attention is on the complexities of expression, the visible signs of an interior thoughtfulness. The diffused crumbling of chalk with the weave of the paper evokes the folds and hollows of skin about the eye and cheek, the tufts of hair straggle over the back of the collar to depict a face at rest yet intent in its gaze, lips slightly parted, as if listening, about to speak. While in the sketch Bernini seems still to search for those physiognomic details most redolent of his developing representation of the cardinal’s habitual mode of expression, in the small caricature drawing a swift and unhesitating economy of pen strokes reduces the face to those elements constitutive of the final portrait’s jovial presence – the jowly cheeks and neck set square on corpulent shoulders, pug nose between mirth-creased eyes – an assured shorthand that conveys confidence and plenitude. In the chalk drawing, however, we see Bernini’s close observation of surface detail, which a caricature does not attempt – the wrinkles and folds of skin at the chin conveyed through grainy smudges of chalk hatching, the trace of stubble across the cheek marked in points and broken lines. The drawing seems to search for the physiognomic detail that the literal imprint of a death mask gave, to discern those particularities of the individual matrix of bone, flesh and skin.

Bernini’s portraits of Scipione throw up several aspects of his preparatory processes that Chantelou’s diary would seem to confirm. Bernini pursued his study of his sitter along two converging but distinct lines. On the one hand he sought the pose, movements and expression most resonant of his model’s habitual stance and everyday gestures, a search for those forms that evoked most powerfully the memory of the sitter’s bodily presence. On the other it was a process intimately concerned with the particular, with the close observation of surface detail – the specific modulations and irregularities of the skin, the distinction of textures wrought by a variegated working of the stone to give off differing refractions of light. To return to the story of Bernini both performing and portraying St Lawrence on the grill, Domenico relates that he ‘drew with chalk and by means of a mirror the motions of pain across the face, and observed the effects of the flames upon the flesh’¹¹¹ – the *moti*, and the *effetti*. This central dualism of capturing both representative motions and lifelike surface details runs throughout all the accounts of his preparatory processes. Both are harnessed to the pursuit of a stunning lifelikeness, endowing inanimate effigies with the illusion of movement, a seeming presence. In the case of the Scipione busts, the central tenets of Bernini’s art and practice fused with the depiction of friendship: of his friend and patron, for whom he was prepared to carve the portrait twice; and of a lively engagement with the viewer thereby cast as friend also.

Chantelou's rich documentation of the making of Bernini's *Louis XIV* bust reveals the unfolding of the artist's process at closer range, a description that scholars have used to trace a general history of his practice. Chantelou's evidence broadly correlates with Domenico's and Guidiccioni's accounts of Bernini at work, suggesting that the example of *Louis XIV*, so well documented by Chantelou, may be used to exemplify his practice.¹¹² To find the *moti* appropriate to his portrayal of the king, Bernini made initial sketches of his model in motion to develop a visual memory of his characteristic gestures; then a succession of models to establish the pose and design. For the *effetti* he conducted further live sittings with the king in order to refine the details of physiognomy and expression in marble.¹¹³ In general, scholars see Bernini's methods in his preparatory drawings and models as marking a fundamental break from common sculptural practice. Bernini did not proceed through the usual succession of increasingly meticulous studies, culminating in a finished template drawing from which to copy the final work.¹¹⁴ On the contrary, his process for a piece like *Louis XIV*, for which he carved the face himself, was devoted to preserving the strongest possible semblance of the immediate, the fiction of life. The statements by the sources on Bernini's process in Paris have little to say about the development of the clay models but highlight the sittings with the king, and thus his methods of working from life at both the beginning and the end of the process. Bernini explained to Chantelou that, in the first instance, he wanted his model not to sit still in a posed position but to move about and talk, because he saw that an image worked up from a still figure could never bear as close a resemblance to life as one that is captured in motion. Thus, instead of establishing a pose from the outset, he used the early sittings to make myriad sketches of the king going about his daily activities in order to learn his model's habitual bodily movements. So, famously, Bernini sketched the king playing tennis, in audience with the English ambassador, in council, in his rooms with his ministers reading letters to him. The essential was that the king move about and talk freely.

The fact that the sources comment on this working method at length shows that it was considered distinctive. What was singled out was the initial process of making 'action sketches' rather than beginning with a pose. Its purpose, as Bernini explained very clearly, was to achieve a greater sense of lifelikeness so as to heighten the illusion of presence. Hence, in the early stages of his work he observed a range of the king's movements from which to cull the most potent poses and countenances. In those few more conventional sittings he drew the king's face from all sides and from many different viewpoints and viewing distances. Had he been constrained to draw the king in one position only, Bernini explained, he would not have been able to make the portrait so 'lively' (*vif*).¹¹⁵ On another occasion, Chantelou records a conversation with a group of academicians who came to see Bernini at work on the bust, during which Bernini expounded the importance of catching his model unaware.¹¹⁶ It was a tactic devoted to capturing the illusion of the spontaneous; at the same time, it was a carefully thought out means of doing so. Yet Bernini also explained to Colbert a further distinction of his preparatory process: that he rarely referred back to these action drawings when developing the pose of the bust.¹¹⁷ Recent conservation reports have found traces of black-chalk preparatory marks on the marble, suggesting that he 'drew' on its surface in a manner similar to the sixteenth-century Venetian practice of painting 'alla prima'.¹¹⁸ The purpose of the 'action sketches' was to stoke his visual memory with an array of the king's most characteristic gestural forms. The final pose he arrived

at for the bust was the culmination of this work, designed to discern that figural idiom most densely charged with Louis's powerful kingly presence.

Different from the portrayal of friendship in his bust of Scipione, the driving affect of *Louis XIV* was to be a sculptural performance of the king's 'majesty'. In his reply to an impatient Colbert, who would have liked to cut short his sittings with the king, this is what Bernini emphasised. His process was, he explained, above all a means to capture 'the idea of His Majesty', which he was developing in his 'imagination', by means of the many studies he had made through drawings, but never copying from them. To work from drawings, he continued, would be to make a copy; in order to make an original, he needed to work with the king. In this way he could make a portrait that was not only a good likeness, but was able to make kingship visible. He defined Louis's majesty as 'that which is in the heads of heroes'. This reflected an enduring archetype of the king in French court literature as 'the greatest hero of all times', which surely drew on a recurring topos of political theory from antiquity that viewed rulership as the natural province of the 'hero' cast as a demi-god, and was later conflated with the notion of divine-right kingship.¹¹⁹ The preparatory methods Bernini developed echo this, their purpose to capture and render the semblance of life, in its particulars but also in its generic form, by searching for that manifestation of the king's body most redolent of a commanding, heroic kingship.

Yet the 'life' model from which Bernini worked was that of the king at court, the daily activities that Bernini observed part of the ongoing performance of court culture in which Louis proffered his royal body to be viewed. In this sense Bernini studied the king playing the part of the king. And in doing so he performed the role of the king's artist, their engagement together played out across numerous sittings that were interspersed among myriad other 'performances' – diplomatic, political, social and cultural – of royal presence. The bust both draws on and embodies this relationship between artist and king, both players in a performance of court and state. Just as Bernini modelled his own artistic practice on concepts of a courtly *facilità* coupled with a sovereign mastery, so he represented the king's image in terms of the regal dissimulation so highly prized and cultivated by a court culture. The artficed semblance of life, pivotal to early modern art criticism, was not just an artistic ambition but a social ideal as well. Its 'hidden' yet seen artistry represented the artist's *facilità*, itself a mirror of the king's power, as one of innate majesty, dissimulated force. In Bernini's words, 'art lies in making something that is all artifice, but appears true'.¹²⁰

Bernini and the French Court

On 21 August 1665, as Bernini worked on the marble in the studio, Chantelou recounts that the king came in accompanied by a host of courtiers. Bernini used this sitting to work on rendering the eyes, which he had said 'would cause him great difficulty', observing that 'great attention must be given to that kind of thing'. As he worked he periodically approached the king to study him from the front and from each side, from head to foot, and every possible angle, then returning to the marble. As the king conversed with his courtiers, Bernini continued to work, sometimes on one eye, then the other, then a little bit at the cheeks. Yet amid these distractions Chantelou also recounts the close attention of this courtly audience to Bernini's work.

Just as Bernini scrutinised the king so the Maréchal de Gramont observed the artist, apparently watching him attentively through an eyeglass.¹²¹

This intent study began with the observing eye of the artist upon his model, the king. In a rare unmediated exchange between Bernini and Louis, the artist acknowledged the boldness of his regard upon the king through a conventional trope of looking with trepidation at a venerated figure, that of the ‘stolen glance’. As he observed the king in motion, every time Louis’s eyes met his own he uttered ‘Sto rubando’ (‘I am stealing’) to explain his forthright stare as the means by which to impress the king’s likeness upon his memory. In a compliment to Bernini’s artistry, Louis replied, in Italian, ‘Si, ma è per restituire’ (‘Yes, but in order to give back’), acknowledging the emerging portrait as the return for this favour of prolonged and intimate observation of his person. This courtly dialogue maps a series of trajectories of vision around the studio, as courtiers studied both the artist, and the king, and their interpretation of each other in art and in life.¹²²

The detail of Gramont training his eyeglass upon Bernini serves to heighten our awareness of how closely this audience watched to see what measures the artist took in finding the king’s form. Beyond royal sittings, when large numbers of courtiers came to see the artist at work, Chantelou also details a constant stream of visitors to the studio, who came in ones and twos to see Bernini and converse with him about his art. Chantelou relates their careful scrutiny of the bust also. For example, on 10 September the engraver Robert Nanteuil ‘tirelessly studied the bust from every angle’, while later that day the Duchesse d’Elbeuf, her stepdaughter and the Marquise de Monglas spent a quarter of an hour looking at it ‘from every side’ to admire the likeness, as if imitating the artist’s sketching of the king ‘from every angle’. Nine days later Jacques Auguste II de Thou, ambassador and collector, also examined the portrait through a small eyeglass, remarking on its resemblance to the beautiful classical heads of Jupiter.¹²³ Their careful observation of Bernini and of his work as it unfolded mirrored Bernini’s close study of the king. Like the play within a play, the court watched the king and the emergence of his double at Bernini’s hand.

On an earlier occasion in Paris, Bernini had engaged another visitor, the Marquise de La Baume, in conversation about viewing practices. To improve the artist’s judgement of his own work, Bernini advocated a long viewing distance, through time or through space, by turning a painting to the wall for some time, or using spectacles that altered the colour or the size, in order to achieve the objective distance of a critic. La Baume described her own means of achieving an intensified viewing as follows: ‘she had an excellent way of making herself see the likeness of the bust to the king: she shut her eyes for some time and then opened them; she found that as she opened them the portrait resembled the King greatly’.¹²⁴ An active viewing practice dedicated to capturing the momentary impression – the purpose of this almost dream-like, as-if-waking, encounter – was to heighten the illusion of presence, the elision of art with life.

Like La Baume, many of Bernini’s visitors in Paris studied the works of art in progress, discussing them with the artist to offer their thoughts as the work unfolded before them. Chantelou documents this type of exchange, allowing us to see the emergence of the work through a social web of discursive art criticism. Recent research suggests that this was not, in itself, unusual in Bernini’s practice. Scholars have highlighted the close and productive ties between Scipione Borghese’s circle and

the early development of Bernini's artistry.¹²⁵ Maffeo Barberini discussed closely with Bernini the choice of themes, but also the development of works both conceptually and formally, his methods of conceiving and of rendering.¹²⁶ Cardinals Sforza Pallavicino and Decio Azzolini, and Paolo Giordano Orsini, also enjoyed such intimate friendships with Bernini that the work of art became, through conversation, the fruit of close concurrence between artist and patron, providing further Italian counterparts to the French example.¹²⁷ What Bernini's Italian biographers stress, and documentary sources would seem to support, is above all Bernini's success in fashioning his relations with his Roman patrons as bonds of friendship. Within the intimacies between Bernini and his patrons, works of art unfolded as the fruits of these bonds, emblems of their ties and articulated by shared interests.

In Paris the web of social relations through which the bust of the king took form was of a different character. My concern here is with what pertains to the social and political fabric of this portrait. Scholars have long noted Bernini's often fraught relations with the French courtiers and their machinations against him.¹²⁸ Bernini's biographers and diarists cast the artist's relationship with the king as one of the greatest mutual admiration, yet through Chantelou we also glimpse moments of immense frustration, which have led some scholars to suggest that the eulogies and elaborate gifts bestowed upon the artist by the king were sheer display.¹²⁹ Both may be true. A panegyric of Louis XIV as a new Alexander, such as the French perpetrated in these years, required an Apelles, an artist able to give visual interpretation to this vision of the king. The inauguration of Louis's 'personal rule' in 1661, just four years before Bernini's arrival, marked a new zenith in the political development of an absolutist, divine-right monarchy in France, severed from older traditions of consultative government. The French surely sought out Bernini as an Apelles for their Alexander, but the myth was inevitably marred by Bernini's extant reputation as artist of the popes, and indeed, at that time, of another Alexander. In this regard we may remember Urban VIII's claim of a symbiosis between artist and pope upon his accession: 'It is your great fortune, Cavalier, to see Cardinal Maffeo Barberini Pope, but our fortune is far greater in that Cavalier Bernini lives during our pontificate.'¹³⁰ For Bernini, the invitation to France was both an honour and a source of conflict. It forged for him a reputation as Europe's greatest artist, servant to both princes and popes; at the same time, it removed him from projects and patronage circles in Rome. Both king and artist wished their relationship to be seen as one that was consummate and complete. Yet Bernini's patronage ties to the papal court were ongoing, and his artistic identity rooted in, and continuing to develop out of, debates and discussion originating in Rome. For their part, the French sought out the visual language of absolutism and divine-right rule that Bernini and others had forged for the popes, but crucially needed to translate this into a national language of their own. Of course such cultural negotiation between artist and patron forms part of the history of the European court artist in general, often working for different courts and patrons and so expected to transpose visual idioms from one context into another. Yet Bernini's exalted status meant that such negotiation could take place only within close bonds like those between an Alexander and an Apelles, something which the French courtiers undermined, opposed and above all mediated. Again, Chantelou's diary allows us to watch this process of cultural negotiation between artist and context at closer quarters than is usually possible. In the case of Bernini's projects for the French court, two projects were lost in the clash

of cultural difference: the plans for the Louvre foundered on the rock of Colbert's relentless interference over the practical details of the king's living quarters, while the disastrous reception of Bernini's equestrian monument of Louis XIV, completed in Rome some twenty years after his departure from Paris, reflects a growing French cultural independence and increasing independence from its Italian antique sources. Yet the bust remains as testament to the possibilities of this exchange in 1665 – a work which Bernini himself described as a collaboration with the king, surely drawing a parallel to his close working relations with many of his Roman patrons, which in some sense mirrored the role of an Apelles.¹³¹ In fact, to his frustration Bernini did not work alone with the king; the bust more accurately represents the interplay between himself, the king and the court. Indeed, carving the king's face became Bernini's virtuoso performance for the French court. While the execution of the bust was not subjected to the administrative rigours of the committees that attended architectural work, Bernini's *Louis XIV* did not issue from an unmediated *amitié* between artist and king either, for the French courtiers were determined to co-opt this bust into their own languages of court and state.

Thus Bernini's many court visitors to his studio in Paris passed critical judgement on the bust at all stages of its facture. Their comments, as recorded by Chantelou, may in the first instance be seen as attempts simply to undermine Bernini's coveted position.¹³² Artistically their criticisms alternated between attempts to absorb the bust into their own traditions of royal portraiture and to fault that which seemed to contradict them. These anxieties about a national culture were rarely voiced directly; instead they were put in terms of oscillating concerns about the descriptive realism of the king's physiognomy. As with the plans for the Louvre, difference expressed itself in physical details behind which lay incompatible languages of etiquette, and it was these that the French court contested most. There was praise for the portrait's comportment and general air of resemblance: the painter Claude Lefebvre discussed with Bernini the close correspondence of the head's placement on the shoulders from behind; the collector Passart praised the 'striking likeness'. Yet signally, the king himself queried the crooked line of his nose, and Bernini's representation of stubble below the mouth – those sharply observed individual traits of the skin that made Bernini's Roman portraits so vividly lifelike to their viewers. There were other comments from the court along similar lines – the jaw was too prominent, the nose misshapen, the cheeks unevenly matched, the eyes – to which Bernini had given his 'great attention' – apparently too wide open and unfocused.¹³³ Such comments, ostensibly drawing attention to instances where Bernini had strayed from his model, were in fact reproaches to the artist for failing to soften and improve those irregularities of the king's features that the court did not acknowledge. Bernini had earlier commented to Chantelou on his careful observation of these slight anomalies in the king's visage, from which study he hoped to obtain a stronger likeness:

The Cavaliere said that in the last two days he had studied the King's face intensively and had found that one side of his mouth differed from the other, and this was also true of the eyes and even of the cheeks; these details would help him get a resemblance.¹³⁴

The Cavaliere had told me in the morning while he was working at the King's nose that it has a very individual trait, for the lower part which adjoins the cheek is narrower than the bridge; this is a detail which could help him towards a likeness.¹³⁵

The French, on the contrary, according to commentaries such as André Félibien's *Portrait du roy* (1663), understood the physiognomics of royalty as perfect and divinely ordained signs of kingship, in which there were no 'accidents' of nature. The artist working from the model would find it 'so excellent there was no need to embellish', for the king's body simply was the ideal embodiment of a divine-right majesty and any apparent fault in his features must therefore be artistic error.¹³⁶

It was Bernini's representation of the king's forehead that was to attract the most mordant criticism from the court for its breach with French *coutume*. In this instance the issues were different, however. We recall that the French styled Louis's hair with a fringe and that the artist had instead chosen to bare it in accordance with Italian mores. In refashioning the actual king's body to match his artistic conception of it Bernini reversed the usual trajectory of portraiture, to make the relationship between the 'original' and the 'copy' fully fused. His accompanying comment, that this was a king who could show his brow to all the world, succeeded in praising Louis and denigrating French custom in equal measure. The courtiers' initial response was a frantic emulation of the king's new hairstyle, followed by furious rejection.¹³⁷ In a court society that so closely coveted and regulated contact with the sovereign through the elaboration of domestic rituals such as the king's *lever* and *coucher*, Bernini's momentary informality, which perfectly expressed a virtuoso dissimulation in Rome, threw an encoded French hierarchy of proximity to the royal body into disarray. The French court's considered hostility to this detail of Bernini's representation was to be trenchant and long-lasting because it touched the raw nerve of cultural difference. In this regard it is crucial to note that Bernini's courtly wit and conversation, so celebrated in the Roman sources, were reduced by the flattening process of translation in Paris. Although his conversation was conducted through the medium of the cultivated and urbane Chantelou, Bernini surely knew himself to be at a disadvantage in navigating the eddies of another etiquette through the opacity of linguistic difference.

As a consummate court artist, Bernini responded to the French court's criticisms of the bust by subsuming them into his developing conception of the king's image. In the case of the king's bare brow, he re-posed the issue as a series of *paragoni* concerned with the depiction of overlapping textures, such as skin through hair, or the sculpting of a lock of hair 'pierced through' across the forehead, thus rivalling the possibilities of nature, painting and literary description with his virtuoso chisel work.¹³⁸ He also asked Chantelou to point out his great technical achievement in the mass of the king's hair, its volume created by means of interwoven locks so that 'some showed through others . . . , a most difficult effect to achieve in marble'.¹³⁹ With the nose and other physiognomic 'irregularities', Bernini chose one of his later sittings with the king to enact his translation before a large court audience of 'a great many people', adjusting and 'correcting' these details by straightening and balancing them, treating them as things he had not previously finished in order to accommodate the French view of the king's features without prejudice to his position. In so doing he transformed these critical exchanges and trans-cultural frustrations into a virtuoso performance of the courtier–artist, to be witnessed in the master's touch upon the work.¹⁴⁰

The King's Likeness

Guidiccioni structured his account of Bernini's working process as a dualism, of *moti* and *effetti*. Let us now turn to the intermediary stage somewhere between these two, which Chantelou alludes to without detailing it, but which is best known to us through the fragmentary remains of the artist's preparatory models in clay. While none remain for the bust of Louis XIV, their survival for other projects is suggestive in illuminating Chantelou's chance references to this moment in Bernini's practice, particularly his reports of the artist's own comments. Elsewhere, Bernini described his clay models as the part 'which establishes the significance of the work'.¹⁴¹ This surely refers to the process by which Bernini decided on the final pose, the particular stylised figuration that was to be the conclusive form. This was in part the sediment of the many 'action sketches' Bernini made of the king through which he found those habitual gestures and expressions most iteratively his. But it is clear from Chantelou's account, both of Bernini's comments as he worked and those of his discussions with visitors, that the process also involved an engagement with what we may term the canons of art, and that this was the means of an intentional and purposeful idealisation of the king's body on the part of the artist. Different from the piecemeal 'correction' of details of physiognomy requested of him by the French, Bernini's means of idealising the portrait drew on a historically constructed vision of the appearance of rulership. Thus his process of establishing the bust's pose was dialectical, between the observation of 'life' and the artist's visual memory of the history of art.¹⁴² The models he called to mind were those with the power to intensify his representation of the king's majesty. To bring these to bear in his observation of the king he recalled the most resonant, pregnant representations of rule, forms enriched by the long history of their imitation, the portraits of antique kings. In this respect his work mirrored French political ideologies that distinguished the generic body of the king from any individual traits.¹⁴³ In political theory, the concept of the king's body encompassed the nation, the body politic – a tenet central to the justification of divine-right absolutism. It was this that Bernini worked to represent through the medium of the antique.

From its earliest stages, Bernini's recurrent conversation with Chantelou had been concerned with capturing the king's likeness in ways that went beyond physiognomic considerations to convey the aura of his *grandeur*. For both Bernini and the French, this was understood to draw on antique prototypes – sculptures and medals, busts of ancient kings and heroes, especially Alexander the Great, whose image was commonly seen as the most richly endowed referent for concepts of rulership, and which was a metaphor for Louis's rule already widely used in court art, ballet, fêtes, ritual and literature, as Bernini must have known. Potent models of the past, such as that of Alexander, infused the court's view of the king himself and their fashioning of their monarch, in his body and in his representations. If the aims were common yet the interpretation of this classical legacy followed different trajectories for Bernini than for the French, and expressed itself in different visual languages. Bernini, too, claimed to see the features of antiquity in those of the king: 'His Majesty had something of the look of Alexander about him, particularly in the forehead and the look of the face' – the same forehead that was to be so contested by the French.¹⁴⁴ Similarly, in his architecture, Bernini contrasted the king's innate *grandeur* with a French style that he viewed as *petit*, arguing that 'buildings [should be] the souls of princes'.¹⁴⁵ This suggests that

Bernini rearranged Louis's hair to uncover his brow because, as he said of his bust, 'one must bring out the qualities of a hero'.¹⁴⁶

My concern here, however, is no longer with the conflict of visual languages between Rome and Paris but with the fusion, or interweaving, of antique prototypes and his observation of Louis's *moti* and *effetti* in Bernini's development of the bust. From the outset Bernini studied Louis XIV's demeanour and expression through the prism of antique models, selecting those gestural motifs that most closely alluded to traditions of imperial majesty. In doing so he sought a synthesis between the performance of the king's individual body at court and an archetypal configuration of kingship. To recall these antique models through his portrait of the king was to endow it with the mantle of the past, calling on those forms most densely charged by the accumulated history of their imperial representation. The pose, the carriage, the configuration of the head, were the distillation of Bernini's long study of the king's body movements with the aim of finding a comportment rich in visual referents of regal *hauteur*, filtered through the lifelong study of ancient sculptures that his biographers attest to. Plutarch described a portrait of Alexander the Great by Lysippus that depicted the ancient king's head 'turning upwards and to the side, with the earth below', a description Bernini seems to echo in Louis's upward gaze, which refuses to acknowledge those who look upon him. And Bernini's visitors, too, saw in the bust these references to antiquity: a visiting bishop noted the resemblance to medals of Alexander the Great,¹⁴⁷ while M. de Thou remarked that the bust was akin to the beautiful classical heads of Jupiter.¹⁴⁸ Chantelou compared the portrait, and particularly the brow, to an antique bust of Ptolemy from his collection, and admired its adherence to the style of 'all the beautiful heads of antiquity'.¹⁴⁹ In a court culture that commonly compared Louis to Alexander, viewers saw the bust, and the king too, through the canons of ancient art.

In this conjoining of the king's features with those of a visual genealogy of rulership lay the bust's force. It resolved the structuring dialectics of the early modern portrait form, and of the representation of royalty. Rendering a recognisable physiognomic likeness that at the same time conveyed the sitter's identity, Bernini realised a vivid lifelikeness in concert with the mantle of an appropriate decorum.¹⁵⁰ In a play of indexical and semiotic resemblances, it is both Louis Bourbon and the Sun King, embodying not only his physical likeness but his symbolic role, measured in the artist's skill. In the words of the papal nuncio in Paris, Carlo Roberti de' Vittori: 'The Cav. Bernini has finished the statue of the king, which is marvellous, beautiful not only as a portrait, but also as a statue.'¹⁵¹ On another occasion one of the king's secretaries and a member of the Académie Française, Toussaint Rose, came with his son 'to admire the likeness of the bust, saying that no one else had succeeded in giving to the King such qualities of nobility and grandeur'.¹⁵² The Duchesse de Nemours, who came accompanied by the playwright Pierre Corneille, spent an hour going back and forth between the bust and other works of art under execution by Bernini's assistants to remark that the portrait 'brought out well [the king's] sense of majesty, which was such that one hardly dared look at him'. She added that the prospect of speaking with the king was so dazzling that one could not look at his face; the portrait, too, possessed this efficacy.¹⁵³ In saying this she again invoked an Alexandrine myth, casting herself as Cassander, who had trembled before a statue of his king, and testifying to the power of the portrait's presence.¹⁵⁴ On another occasion, a visiting ambassador 'praised the portrait and said that the King looked as if he were giving a military command to [his

generals] . . . ; although it had no limbs [he said] it had a great feeling of movement – of life'.¹⁵⁵ Bernini's famed 'speaking likeness' was here understood as that of royal command.¹⁵⁶ Félibien's 1663 description of the king's painted portraits similarly invoked his bearing of command: 'so great, noble and at ease . . . [we] recognise you as you appear when, at the head of your armies, you inspire new ardour in the soul of all those who have the honour of following you'.¹⁵⁷ It was in this regard that Bernini, too, most fully met the representational demands of an absolutist French monarchy, of a military valour conveying the act of royal command – the quality that Chantelou repeatedly termed *grandeur* or *hauteur* ('majesty').

On 29 September, as the bust neared completion, Colbert remarked that in this portrait he seemed to see the king as he had been when, in 1655 at the age of seventeen, he had appeared in the assembly chamber of the *parlement* 'wearing his riding boots'. In his way, Colbert too recalled the topos of a portrait so lifelike in its resemblance that it seemed to embody the live model. The event Colbert envisioned through the portrait occurred shortly after the Fronde, when the *parlement* met to debate certain of Louis's royal edicts. The young king had appeared in the chamber in hunting dress with a riding crop in his hand to order the *parlement* to register them instantly, commanding 'with majestic bearing . . . and air of mastery': 'I forbid you to allow any assemblies'.¹⁵⁸ In likening the bust to this turning point in the history of Louis's reign, Colbert accurately summed up its place in the history of European art as a consummate expression of the social ideologies of early modern absolutism.¹⁵⁹ A possible vindication of Colbert's otherwise questionable acumen as a viewer, his comment accords with his expectations of Bernini expressed in a letter of 1664: that the work for the French impart respect in the soul of the people and impress upon them the king's power.¹⁶⁰

In command yet at ease, the bust perfectly represents the mask of a king in a court culture, embodying the claim to a divine-right majesty. Its life-size scale worked as a literal 'double' of the king within the royal household.¹⁶¹ It formed part of that metonymic conflation of the domestic with statehood that was the role of the seventeenth-century French royal palace as a whole, in which the king was both *premier gentilhomme* of the household and absolute monarch of France. The dynamic sense of movement in the bust of Louis XIV epitomises the French concept of kingship as one of heroic action: the thrust of the right shoulder with its corresponding turn of the head suggests a forward motion, reinforced by billowing draperies and leonine hair, whose textural magnificence encodes a regal status within portraiture's art of describing. The slightly parted lips, 'just before or just after speaking',¹⁶² convey the air of regal address to the audience that the Venetian ambassador and Colbert sensed, and contribute to the illusion of movement, from which we may project the moment past and that to follow. Sculptural modulations of the surface give a modelling to the face that is idealising in its taut amplitude, yet so vivid that we seem to see muscles at work beneath the skin. The piercing, raised focus of the eyes looks over the viewer's head. If the bust of Scipione seemed to engage the viewer with its direct gaze, that of Louis transforms the viewer into a supplicant, as the Duchesse de Nemours knew.¹⁶³ An embodied effigy of Europe's greatest monarch by its finest sculptor, the bust's prodigious presence both simulated and dissimulated the king's 'invincible power' as well as the artist's 'inimitable skill'. So lifelike as to defy its artistry, the bust, like the king, succeeded because

it held together the contradictions of its position. Its form gave visual expression to the political claims of the absolutist monarch: namely, that the symbolic ‘body’ of the godlike king incorporated the many social groups of a body politic, once fragmented by the Fronde and now reunited within his very figure itself. A consummate artistic illusion wrought through the sculptor’s craft, the work conveys the aura of the king’s majesty through the sign of his royal body – *grandeur, hauteur, majesté*.

On 5 October, Bernini conducted his last sitting with the king:

Directly [the king] saw the bust on the stand, draped round with the velvet, he showed his delight. He studied it for some time and made them all do the same. . . . And everyone vied with each other in praising it. His Majesty then placed himself in the usual position. . . . The Cavaliere, leading the prince de Marsillac, who stood near him, to a place where the King could turn his eyes on him, he took a piece of charcoal and marked the pupils on the bust. That done, he said to His Majesty that the work was finished and he wished that it had been more perfect; he had worked at it with so much love that it was the least bad portrait he had done.¹⁶⁴

Like the presentation of the busts of Scipione Borghese with which this chapter began, Bernini’s final touches to the portrait of Louis XIV were also a last performance of his artistry for the king and his court. The king arrived to find his portrait mounted on a stand draped round with velvet. He then took his ‘pose’, that of the king having his portrait done. In order to complete the bust, it remained only to fix the gaze of the eyes. To do this Bernini proceeded by means of a ‘sketch’, a play within the play of court life, asking a prince to assume a counter-pose to Louis XIV’s position onto which he could direct the king’s sight. In marking the direction of the living king’s glance onto the marble, Bernini completed the portrait with a final performance of his *facilità*. The circuit of gazes that had enveloped the bust throughout its making – the artist watching Louis attentively, or with a ‘stolen’ glance; the court watching the artist from afar at the doorway or close up with an eyeglass; those viewers of the bust who both scrutinised it carefully and those who found they had to close their eyes or look away – were all resolved in the raised eyes of the king looking over his subjects’ heads.¹⁶⁵ Pygmalion-like, Bernini’s mark of the artist’s hand on the eyes endowed the effigy with the semblance of life – *vivacità*. Baldinucci’s three-point definition of this term in his *Vocabolario* bears the acknowledged imprint of talk among practitioners, such as might have occurred in Bernini’s studio: that the eyes should have a fixed gaze, open nostrils should seem to exhale breath, and the mouth be open as if speaking.¹⁶⁶ Recent conservation reports have commented upon black chalk that outlines the eyes and darkens the pupils of many of Bernini’s sculptures, as Chantelou describes here; while it is no longer readily visible in the bust of Louis XIV, it can be seen clearly in the much earlier Borghese works such as *Apollo and Daphne*, *David* and *Pluto and Proserpina* (figs 00 and 00), lending their faces a more intent focus, a ‘fixed gaze’.¹⁶⁷ Bernini’s final touch would seem to correct the earlier criticisms of French courtiers that the king’s eyes appeared unfocused and meet the critical expectations that Baldinucci voiced by recourse to a means practised much earlier in his career. Gazing, breathing, speaking – these were the elements of lifelikeness by which means Bernini brought to life both Louis XIV and his own artistic identity. Just as the image of the king possessed the spirit of its antique ancestors so the artist re-enacted the legends

of his predecessors. Like Daedalus, like Pygmalion before him, Bernini's final master-stroke gave the marble life. And it was above all this act of artistic illusion that Bernini's audience came to see – the artist 'finding the forms magically hidden within the marble', 'ecstatic, in the act of . . . bringing stone to life'.¹⁶⁸

Thereafter, Bernini began to orchestrate the placing of the bust, with concerns about the lighting, which was not to be too harsh, and about a space that allowed a good viewing distance. Its initial situation was to be in the antechamber to the king's new audience hall; but its display history was to be one of movement between royal palaces until it found its present collocation at Versailles nearly twenty years later in 1685.¹⁶⁹ Until the planned pedestal should be finished (though this was never, in fact, achieved), Bernini put the bust on a table draped with gold cloth. The early history of its presentation therefore remained open; it became part of the royal collection and so, like court art of the period more generally, was redeployed as circumstances required. This, too, would have formed part of the horizon of expectations within which Bernini worked.¹⁷⁰ Chantelou recounts two visits to view the bust in the antechamber in the company of others, the first with the king's household in attendance. Discussion, including criticism, continued,¹⁷¹ as during Bernini's work on the bust, to the point that we can speak of an ongoing culture of reception throughout its production and into its subsequent history of display, rather than one limited to a fixed moment of 'conclusion'.

This ongoing 'reception' of the bust, throughout its execution, illustrates the genesis of the work of art in a court culture, materialising within a complex network of social relations and cultural expectations. As the spectatorship of art-making became the province of a court society, so practice and reception became interfused. No longer consecutive but interwoven, and so at times even instrumental, the court's reception of its artistic products became part of the material with which the artist worked. The work developed through this courtly dialogue between the artist and his audience, a performance of process that Bernini refined into an art form itself. The network of glances, gazes and viewing that encircled the bust throughout and beyond its making emblematised, cipher-like, the web of social relations through which the work took form. Many scholars have noted that Bernini's trip to Paris formed part of a history of diplomatic cultural exchange, in which figures of cultural renown served foreign princes as 'gifts' from one court to another. In this instance, Bernini's specific presence in Paris followed the humiliating Peace of Pisa of 1664, after which Pope Alexander VII sent his artist to France as a peace offering to the French.¹⁷² Thus the early modern court sought to acquire the artist's presence along with his art, so as to witness the performance of the artist at work, and to see the illusion of art unfold. Bernini rose to meet this demand through a performance of artistry that made him pre-eminent in Italy, and throughout Europe, matched only by Rubens and Velázquez.

This analysis argues that the production of art unfolds within the cultural spaces of its fabrication, and is contingent on their social structures. An early modern court culture required the skilful rendering of majesty's aura, conceived and executed through the etiquette of elite discourse. It was the performance of this illusion, by means of refined social exchange as well as artistic *techne* that Bernini practised, both in Rome and in Paris. Signally, the 'idea' of the bust arose through courtly dialogue, in which Bernini spoke both of the great *difficoltà* of his art and his even greater willingness to harness it in the service of this great king: 'His Majesty . . . [said] that it

would give Him great pleasure . . . to have His portrait done in marble by his hand, to which the Cavaliere replied that His Majesty could not ask him for a more noble, nor a more difficult thing.¹⁷³

The nobility of his artistry lay in its consummate virtuosity, dissimulated through a courtier's decorum and 'given' as a sign, or mirror, of the king's divinely ordained power to command. This portrait, of a 'speaking likeness', was itself composed from an assembly of speech acts, an ensemble of performances, its form mapping the field of courtly interactions that produced it. Throughout the dialectics of its facture, the 'action' sketches and the animating conversations, its matter was the web of social life that structured its fabrication. Bernini's *Louis XIV*, and the documentation of its making, stand as testaments to a finely honed artistic process that embodied, almost literally, the performance of court life out of which it arose.

Bibliography

- Abel, Lionel, 1963. *Metatheatre: A New View of Dramatic Form* (New York)
- Acidini Luchinat, Cristina, 1981. 'La raccolta dei beni', *Gian Lorenzo Bernini: il testamento, la casa, la raccolta dei beni*, ed. Franco Borsi (Florence), 39–52
- Ackerman, James, 1982. 'The Planning of Renaissance Rome, 1450–1580', *Rome in the Renaissance: The City and the Myth*, ed. P. A. Ramsey (Binghamton, NY), 3–18
- , 1990. *The Villa: Form and Ideology of Country Houses* (London)
- Ackermann, Felix, 2007. *Die Altäre des Gian Lorenzo Bernini: Das barocke Altarensemble im Spannungsfeld zwischen Tradition und Innovation* (Petersberg)
- Adamson, John, ed., 1999. *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture under the Ancien Régime, 1500–1750* (London)
- Ademollo, Alessandro, 1883. *Il carnevale di Roma nei secoli xvii e xviii* (Rome)
- , 1888. *I teatri di Roma nel secolo decimosettimo* (Bologna)
- Adorno, Theodore, 1967. 'Valery Proust Museum' (1955), trans. Samuel Weber and Shierry Weber, in *Prisms* (London)
- Alberti, Leon Battista, 1972. *On Painting and On Sculpture*, c.1440, trans. Cecil Grayson (London)
- Alonge, Roberto, and Guido Davico Bonino, 2000. *La nascita del teatro moderno: Cinque-Seicento*, vol. 1 of *Storia del teatro moderno e contemporaneo* (Turin).
- Alpers, Svetlana, 1988. *Rembrandt's Enterprise: The Studio and the Market* (Chicago)
- , 2005. *The Vexations of Art: Velázquez and Others* (New Haven, Conn., and London)
- , and Michael Baxandall, 1994. *Tiepolo and the Pictorial Intelligence* (New Haven, Conn.)
- Ameyden, Teodoro, n.d. 'Diario della città e corte di Roma, notato da Deone hora Temi Dio', 3 vols., Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, MSS 1831–1833
- Amidei, Rosanna Barbiellini, Livia Carloni and Claudia Tempesta, 1999. *Andrea Sacchi, 1599–1661* (Rome)
- Anderson, Benedict, 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London)
- Anderson, Perry, 1974. *Lineages of the Absolutist State* (London)
- Angelini, Alessandro, 1998. *Gian Lorenzo Bernini e i Chigi tra Roma e Siena* (Siena)
- Anselmi, Alessandra, 2005. 'Theatres for the Canonisation of Saints', *St Peter's in the Vatican*, ed. William Tronzo (Cambridge), 244–69
- Antinori, Aloisio, 1995. *Scipione Borghese e l'architettura: Programmi, progetti, cantieri alle soglie dell'età barocca* (Rome)
- , 2008. *La magnificenza e l'utile: Progetto urbano e monarchia papale nella Roma del Seicento* (Rome)
- Apostolidès, Jean-Marie, 1981. *Le roi-machine: Spectacle et politique au temps de Louis XIV* (Paris)
- Arasse, Daniel, 1972. 'Extase et visions béatifiques à l'apogée de la Renaissance: Quatre images de Raphaël', *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome: Moyen âge, temps modernes*, 84, 403–92
- , 1984. 'Les miroirs de la peinture', *L'imitation: Aliénation ou source de liberté? Rencontres de l'École du Louvre*, 63–88
- , 1992. *Le détail: Pour une histoire rapprochée de la peinture* (Paris)
- Argan, Giulio Cesare, 1955. 'La "rettorica" e l'arte barocca', *Atti del III Congresso internazionale di studi umanistici*, ed. Enrico Castelli (Rome), 9–14

- Aronberg Lavin, Marilyn, 1975. *Seventeenth-Century Barberini Documents and Inventories of Art* (New York)
- Arscott, Caroline, and Katie Scott, eds, 2000. *Manifestations of Venus: Art and Sexuality* (Manchester and New York)
- Artaud, Antonin, 1964. *Le théâtre et son double* (Paris)
- Arzone, Rossana, 1995. *Pasquinate del seicento: le invettive delle 'statue parlanti' contro il potere delle nobili famiglie alla conquista di Roma barocca* (Rome)
- Asch, Ronald G., and Adolf M. Birke, eds, 1991. *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age, c.1450–1650* (Oxford)
- Ascione, Francesco, 1651. *Le lodi e grandezze dell'aguglia e fontana di Piazza Navona* (Rome)
- Auslander, Philip, 1999. *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture* (London)
- Austin, J. L., 1962. *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford)
- Averett, Matthew Knox, 2006. 'Bernini at the Piazza Barberini: Patronage and Public Space in the Rome of Urban VIII', PhD dissertation, University of Missouri–Columbia
- Avery, Charles, 2002. *Bernini: The Model for the Fountain of the Moor* (New York)
- Ayala, Pier Giovanni d', and Martine Boiteux, eds, 1988. *Carnavals et mascarades* (Paris)
- Bacchi, Andrea, 2009. "L'arte della scultura non habbi mai havuto homo pari a questo": La breve gloria romana di Giuliano Finelli', *I marmi vivi: Bernini e la nascita del ritratto barocco*, ed. Andrea Bacchi, Tomaso Montanari, Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi and Dimitrios Zikos (Florence and Milan), 137–64 [exhibition catalogue]
- , Catherine Hess and Jennifer Montagu, eds, 2008. *Bernini and the Birth of the Baroque Portrait Bust* (Los Angeles)
- , Tomaso Montanari, Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi and Dimitrios Zikos, eds, 2009. *I marmi vivi: Bernini e la nascita del ritratto barocco* (Florence and Milan) [exhibition catalogue]
- , Catherine Hess and Evonne Levy, eds, 2011. *Sculpture Journal*, 20 [special issue]
- Bacon, Francis, 1857. *The Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis and Douglas Denon Heath, vol. 3 (London)
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, 1984. *Rabelais and his World* (1965), trans. Hélène Iswolsky, (Bloomington, Ind.)
- Bal, Mieke, 2003. 'Ecstatic Aesthetics: Metaphoring Bernini', *Compelling Visuality: The Work of Art In and Out of History*, ed. Claire Farago and Robert Zwijnenberg (Minneapolis and London), 1–30
- Baldi, Bernardino, 1601. *Di Herone Alessandrino, degli automati overo machine semoventi* (Venice)
- Baldinucci, Filippo, 1681. *Vocabolario toscano dell'arte del disegno* (Florence)
- , 1948. *Vita di Bernini* (1682), ed. Sergio Samek Ludovici (Milan)
- , 1966. *The Life of Bernini* (1682), trans. Catherine Enggass (University Park, Penn.)
- , 1974. *Notizie dei professori del disegno da Cimabue in qua*, 6 vols (1681–1728), ed. F. Ranalli, 6 vols (Florence: Studio per Edizioni Scelte)
- Bandera, Sandrina, 1999. 'Bernini e Chantelou: Affinità elettive ante litteram', *Paragone: Arte*, 24–5, 57–81
- Bandera Bistoletti, Sandrina, 1985. 'Lettura di testi berniniani: Qualche scoperta e nuove osservazioni dal Journal di Chantelou e dai documenti della Bibliothèque Nationale di Parigi', *Paragone: Arte*, 36, 43–70
- Barasch, Moshe, 1987. *Giotto and the Language of Gesture* (Cambridge)
- Barcham, William L., 2001. *Grand in Design: The Life and Career of Federico Cornaro, Prince of the Church, Patriarch of Venice and Patron of the Arts* (Venice)
- Barkan, Leonard, 1986. *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven, Conn.)

- , 1999. *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture*, (New Haven, Conn., and London)
- Barnard, Mary E., 1987. *The Myth of Apollo and Daphne from Ovid to Quevedo: Love, Agon, and the Grotesque* (Durham)
- Barrell, John, 1980. *The Dark Side of the Landscape: The Rural Poor in English Painting, 1730–1840* (Cambridge)
- Barthes, Roland, 1964. 'Le théâtre de Baudelaire', *Essais critiques* (Paris), 41–7
- Baudrillard, Jean, 1968. *Le système des objets* (Paris)
- Bauer, George C., 1976. *Bernini in Perspective* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ)
- , 1982. 'From Architecture to Scenography: The Full-Scale Model in the Baroque Tradition', *La scenografia barocca. Atti del XXIV Congresso internazionale di storia dell'arte*, 5, ed. Antoine Schnapper (Bologna), 141–50
- Bauer, Hermann, 1989. 'Zum Illusionismus Berninis', *Antikenrezeption im Hochbarock*, ed. Herbert Beck and Sabine Schulze (Berlin), 129–42
- Baxandall, Michael, 1972. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style* (Oxford)
- Beck, Herbert, and Sabine Schulze, 1989. *Antikenrezeption im Hochbarock* (Berlin)
- Beecher, Donald, and Massimo Ciavolella, 1985. 'A Comedy by Bernini', *Gianlorenzo Bernini: New Aspects of his Art and Thought*, ed. Irving Lavin (University Park, Penn., and London), 63–114
- Bellini, Eraldo, 2006. 'From Mascardi to Pallavicino: The Biographies of Bernini and Seventeenth-Century Roman Culture', *Bernini's Biographies: Critical Essays*, ed. Maarten Delbeke, Evonne Levy and Steven F. Ostrow (University Park, Penn.), 275–314
- Bellori, G. P., 1976. *Le vite de' pittori, scultori, et architetti moderni* (1672), ed. E. Borea (Turin)
- Belting, Hans, 1990. *Bild und Kunst: eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst* (Munich)
- Benes, Mirka, and Diane Harris, eds, 2001. *Villas and Gardens in Early Modern Italy and France* (Cambridge)
- Bermingham, Ann, 1986. *Landscape as Ideology: The English Rustic Tradition, 1740–1860* (Berkeley, Calif.)
- Bernardini, Maria Grazia, and Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco, eds, 1999. *Gian Lorenzo Bernini: Regista del barocco* (Milan) [exhibition catalogue]
- Bernini, Domenico, 1999. *Vita del cavalier Gio. Lorenzo Bernini* (1713) (Perugia)
- Bertozzi, Marco, ed., 2002. *Aby Warburg e le metamorfosi degli antichi dèi* (Modena)
- Besso, Marco, n.d. [1904]. *Roma e il papa nei proverbi e nei modi di dire* (Rome)
- Bewer, Francesca G., 1999. 'Bronze Casts after Bozzetti and Modelli by Bernini', *Sketches in Clay for Projects by Gian Lorenzo Bernini: Theoretical, Technical, and Case Studies*, ed. Ivan Gaskell and Henry Lie (*Harvard University Art Museums Bulletin*, 6/3), 162–7
- Biagioli, Mario, 1993. *Galileo, Courtier: The Practice of Science in the Culture of Absolutism* (Chicago)
- Bjurström, Per, 1966. *Feast and Theatre in Queen Christina's Rome* (Stockholm)
- Blaauw, S. de, P.-M. Gijsbers, S. Schütze and B. Treffers, eds, 1998. *Docere, delectare, movere: Affetti, devozione e retorica nel linguaggio artistico del primo barocco romano* (Rome)
- Blunt, Anthony, 1978. 'Gianlorenzo Bernini: Illusionism and Mysticism', *Art History*, 1, 73–8
- Bodart, Diane H., 2006. 'L'excellence du portrait par Gian Lorenzo Bernini, ou la ressemblance à l'épreuve de l'idea', *Studiolo: Revue d'Histoire de l'Art de l'Académie de France à Rome*, 4, 39–60
- Boiteux, Martine, 1977. 'Formes de la fête: Le carnaval annexé. Essai de lecture d'une fête romaine', *Annales ESC*, 2, 355–80

- , 1992. 'Barocco e commemorazione: Tra durevole e effimero', *Il barocco romano e l'Europa*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna, Centri e Periferie del Barocco, 1 (Rome), 695–726
- , 2004. 'Le Bernin, les fêtes et l'architecture éphémère à Rome au début du XVII siècle', *Bernini dai Borghese ai Barberini: La cultura a Roma intorno agli anni venti*, ed. Olivier Bonfait and Anna Coliva (Rome), 77–91
- Bolduc, Benoît, 2010. 'Stefano della Bella, inventeur des gravures des "Nozze degli dei" (1637) et de "Mirame" (1641)', *Rome–Paris 1640: Transferts culturels et renaissance d'un centre artistique*, ed. Marc Bayard (Rome and Paris), 481–507
- Bolland, Andrea, 2000. 'Desiderio and diletto: Vision, Touch, and the Poetics of Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne*', *Art Bulletin*, 82, 309–30
- Bonfait, Olivier, 2002. *L'idéale classique: Les échanges artistiques entre Rome et Paris au temps de Bellori* (Rome)
- , and Anna Coliva, eds, 2004. *Bernini dai Borghese ai Barberini: La cultura a Roma intorno agli anni venti* (Rome)
- Bonifacio, Giovanni, 1616. *L'arte dei cenni* (Vicenza)
- Borghese, G., 1954. *I Borghese*, vol. 10 of *Le grandi famiglie romane* (Rome)
- Borromeo, Carlo, 1962. *Instructiones fabricae et supellectilis ecclesiasticae* (1577), *Trattati d'Arte del Cinquecento fra Manierismo e Controriforma*, ed. Paola Barocchi (Bari)
- Borsi, Franco, Cristina Acidini Luchinat and Francesco Quinterio, eds, 1981. *Gian Lorenzo Bernini: Il testamento, la casa, la raccolta dei beni* (Florence)
- , 2000. *Bernini architetto* (1980), 2nd edn (Milan)
- Boschloo, Anton, ed., 1989. *Academies of Art between Renaissance and Romanticism* (*Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, 5–6, 1986–7) (The Hague)
- Boselli, Orfeo, 1994. *Osservazioni sulla scultura antica* (1650s), ed. Antonio P. Torresi, preface by Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco (Ferrara)
- Bottari, Giovanni Gaetano, and Stefano Ticozzi, eds, 1979. *Raccolta di lettere sulla pittura, scultura ed architettura* (1754–68; 8 vols, 1822–5), repr. (Bologna)
- Boucher, Bruce, 1998. *Italian Baroque Sculpture* (London)
- , ed., 2001. *Earth and Fire: Italian Terracotta Sculpture from Donatello to Canova* (New Haven, Conn., and London) [exhibition catalogue, Museum of Fine Arts, Houston; Victoria and Albert Museum, London]
- Boudon-Machuel, Marion, 2004. 'La "ressemblance vivante" et le buste funéraire à Rome dans les années 1620', *Bernini dai Borghese ai Barberini: La cultura a Roma intorno agli anni venti*, ed. Olivier Bonfait and Anna Coliva (Rome), 64–75
- Branca, Giovanni, 1629. *Le machine: volume nuovo et di molto artificio da fare effetti maravigliosi tanto spiritali quanto di animale operatione arichito di bellissime figure* (Rome)
- Brauer, Heinrich, and Rudolf Wittkower, 1931. *Die Zeichnungen des Gianlorenzo Bernini*, 2 vols (Berlin)
- Brecht, Bertolt, 1996. 'Short description of a new technique of acting which produces an alienation effect' (1951), *The Twentieth-Century Performance Reader*, ed. Michael Huxley and Noel Witts (London), 99–111
- Bredenkamp, Horst, 1995. *The Lure of Antiquity and the Cult of the Machine: The Kunstkammer and the Evolution of Nature, Art, and Technology*, trans. Allison Brown, (Princeton, NJ)
- Briganti, Giuliano, 1962. *Pietro da Cortona, o Della pittura barocca* (Rome)
- Brinckmann, Albert Erich, 1923–5. *Barock-Bozzetti*, 4 vols (Frankfurt)
- Brosses, Charles de, 1986. *Lettres d'Italie*, ed. Frédéric d'Agay, 2 vols (Paris)
- Bruni, Antonio, 1633. 'Per la statua di Daphne, ch'è nella villa dell'emin[en]tiss[imo] Sig. [nore] Cardinal Borghese', *Le veneri* (Rome)
- Bruno, Giuliana, 2007. *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture and Film* (2002), 2nd edn (London)

- Bruno, Silvia, 2005. 'Arte e teatro nelle residenze romane dei Barberini', *Lo spettacolo del sacro, la morale del profano: Su Giulio Rospigliosi (Papa Clemente IX). Atti del Convegno internazionale, Pistoia, 23–23 settembre 2000*, ed. Danilo Romei (Florence), 67–88
- Buccheri, Alessandra, 2003. 'L'architettura delle nuvole tra teatro e pittura: Ludovico Cigoli e Giovanni da San Giovanni', *Proporzioni*, 4, 115–35
- Bulwer, John, 1974. *Chirologia, or The Natural Language of the Hand ... whereunto is added Chironomia, or The Art of Manual Rhetoric* (1644), ed. James W. Cleary (London and Amsterdam)
- Burke, Peter, 1993a. *The Art of Conversation* (Cambridge)
- Burke, Peter, 1993b. 'The Language of Gesture in Early Modern Italy', *A Cultural History of Gesture, from Antiquity to the Present Day*, ed. Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (Cambridge), 71–83
- , 1995. *The Fortunes of the Courtier: The European Reception of Castiglione's Cortegiano* (Cambridge)
- , 1997. 'Frontiers of the Comic in Early Modern Italy, c. 1350–1750', *A Cultural History of Humour, from Antiquity to the Present Day*, ed. Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg (Cambridge), 61–75
- Butler, Judith, 1997. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (New York and London)
- Bynum, Caroline Walker, 1997. 'Wonder', *American Historical Review*, 102, 1–26
- , 1998. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, Calif.)
- , 2007. *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond* (Philadelphia)
- Calabi, Donatella, and Stephen Turk Christiansen, eds, 2007. *Cities and Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe, 1400–1700* (Cambridge)
- Calvesi, Maurizio, 1990. *Le realtà del Caravaggio* (Turin)
- , 1996. 'A gara con la Roma imperiale', *I Borghese*, vol. 1: *Storia di una famiglia* (Rome), 14–41 [exhibition catalogue]
- Camille, Michael, 1989. *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-Making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge)
- Camiz, Franca Trinchieri, 1988. 'The Castrato Singer: From Informal to Formal Portraiture', *Artibus et Historiae*, 18, 171–86
- Campbell, Stephen J., ed., 2004. *Artists at Court: Image-Making and Identity, 1300–1550* (Chicago)
- Campitelli, Alberta, 1994. *Il parco di villa Borghese* (Rome)
- , ed., 2005. *Villa Borghese: Storia e gestione* (Milan)
- Cancellieri, Francesco, 1811. *Il mercato, il lago dell'Acqua Vergine ed il Palazzo Panfiliano nel Circo Agonale* (Rome)
- Capitoline Museums, 1991. *Il Campidoglio e Sisto V*, ed. Luigi Spezzaferro and Maria Elisa Tittoni (Rome)
- Carandini, Silvia, 1978. 'Una società della festa: Committenti, luoghi, occasioni, organizzazione, pubblico', *L'effimero barocco: Strutture della festa nella Roma del '600*, vol. 2 (Rome), 285–472
- , 2001. 'Le metamorfosi di una nuvola: Gian Lorenzo Bernini drammaturgo, scenografo, personaggio e attore', *Teatro e palcoscenico dall'Inghilterra all'Italia, 1540–1640*, ed. Anna Maria Palombi Cataldi (Rome), 211–26
- Careri, Giovanni, 1995a. *Flights of Love: The Art of Devotion (Voli d'amore: Architettura, pittura e scultura nel 'bel composto' di Bernini, 1991)*, trans. Linda Lappin (Chicago)
- , 1995b. 'Le lingue comuni dell'Europa, dall'Umanesimo ai Lumi: le arti', *L'età moderna, secoli xvi–xviii*, ed. Maurice Aymard, vol. 4 of *Storia d'Europa* (Turin), 363–81

- , 2002. 'Aby Warburg e l'intensificazione delle immagini', *Aby Warburg e le metamorfosi degli antichi dei*, ed. Marco Bertozzi (Modena), 50–62
- , 2003. 'Aby Warburg: Rituel, *Pathosformel* et forme intermédiaire' *L'Homme*, 165, 41–76
- , 2005. *Gestes d'amour et de guerre: La Jérusalem délivrée, images et affects (xvi–xviii siècle)* (Paris)
- Carlioni, Livia, 1999. 'La Cappella Cornaro in Santa Maria della Vittoria: Nuove evidenze e acquisizioni sulla "men cattiva opera"', *Gian Lorenzo Bernini. Regista del barocco: I restauri*, ed. Claudio Strinati and Maria Grazia Bernardini (Rome), 37–46
- Carracciolo, E., and E. Zatti, 1997. 'Il restauro delle sculture', *Apollo e Dafne del Bernini nella Galleria Borghese*, ed. Kristina Herrmann Fiore (Milan), 149–160
- Castagnetti, Marina, 1993. 'La Caprarola ed altre gallerie: Cinque lettere di Maffeo Barberini ad Aurelio Orsi', *Studi Secenteschi*, 34, 411–50
- Chafe, Eric T., 1992. *Monteverdi's Tonal Language* (New York)
- Chantelou, Paul Fréart de, 1985. *Diary of the Cavaliere Bernini's Visit to France (1645)*, trans. Marjorie Corbett, ed. Anthony Blunt, Princeton and Guildford, 1985
- , 2001. *Journal de voyage du cavalier Bernin en France (1645)*, ed. Milovan Stani (Paris)
- Chastel, André, 1956. 'Les lieux de la fête', *Les fêtes de la Renaissance*, ed. Jean Jacquot (Paris), 419–24
- , 1993. *La pala ou le retable italien des origines à 1500* (Paris)
- , 2001. *Le geste dans l'art* (Paris)
- Christian, Mary, 1986. 'Bernini's Danube and Pamphili Politics', *Burlington Magazine*, 128, 354–5.
- Christiansen, Keith, 1990. *A Caravaggio Rediscovered: The Lute Player* (New York) [exhibition catalogue, Metropolitan Museum of Art]
- Cieri Via, Claudia, Pietro Montani and Benedetta Cestelli Guidi, eds, 2004. *Lo sguardo di Giano: Aby Warburg fra tempo e memoria* (Turin)
- Cipriani, Angela, 1987. 'Un bozzetto per il leone della Fontana dei Fiumi', *Gian Lorenzo Bernini e le arti visive*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo (Rome), 139–47
- Ciucci, Giorgio, 1974. *Piazza del Popolo: storia, architettura, urbanistica*, Rome
- Clark, T. J., 1992. 'Jackson Pollock's Abstraction', *Reconstructing Modernism: Art in New York, Paris, and Montreal, 1945–1964*, ed. Serge Guilbaut (Cambridge, Mass., and London), 172–243
- Clément, Pierre, 1861–82. *Lettres, instructions et mémoires de Colbert*, 8 vols (Paris)
- Clementi, Filippo, 1899. *Il carnevale romano nelle cronache* (Rome)
- Coffin, David R., ed., 1972. *The Italian Garden* (Washington, DC)
- , 1979. *The Villa in the Life of Renaissance Rome* (Princeton, NJ)
- , 1991. *Gardens and Gardening in Papal Rome* (Princeton, NJ)
- Cole, Michael, 2007. 'Bernini Struts', *Material Identities*, ed. Joanna Sofaer (Oxford), 55–66
- , and Mary Pardo, eds, 2005. *Inventions of the Studio: Renaissance to Romanticism* (Chapel Hill, SC, and London)
- Coliva, Anna, 1998. 'Casa Borghese: La committenza artistica del Cardinal Scipione', *Bernini scultore: La nascita del barocco in Casa Borghese*, ed. Anna Coliva and Sebastian Schütze (Rome), 389–422 [exhibition catalogue]
- , 1999. 'I gruppi monumentali borghesiani', *Gian Lorenzo Bernini. Regista del barocco: I restauri*, ed. Claudio Strinati and Maria Grazia Bernardini (Rome), 7–12
- , ed., 2002. *Bernini scultore: la tecnica esecutiva* (Rome)
- , ed., 2011. *I Borghese e l'antico* (Milan) [exhibition catalogue]
- , and Sebastian Schütze, eds, 1998. *Bernini scultore: La nascita del barocco in Casa Borghese* (Rome) [exhibition catalogue]

- Connors, Joseph, 1989. 'Alliance and Enmity in Roman Baroque Urbanism', *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 25, 207–94
- Cordemoy, Géraud de, 1668. *De la réformation d'un état* (XXXXXX)
- Courtright, Nicola, 1981. 'Four Rivers Fountain', *Drawings by Gian Lorenzo Bernini*, ed. Irving Lavin (Princeton, NJ), 108–19
- Cousinié, Frédéric, 2002. 'De la morbidezza du Bernin au "sentiment de la chair" dans la sculpture française', *Le Bernin et l'Europe: Du baroque triomphant à l'âge romantique*, ed. Chantal Grell and Milovan Stani (Paris), 283–302
- Cropper, Elizabeth, and Charles Dempsey, 1996. *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting* (Princeton, NJ)
- Culler, Jonathan D., 2000. 'Philosophy and Literature: The Fortunes of the Performative', *Poetics Today*, 21, 503–19
- Cureau de La Chambre, Pierre, 1999. *Préface pour servir à l'histoire de la vie et des ouvrages du cavalier Bernin et l'Éloge de monsieur le cavalier Bernin, c.1685*, ed. Tomaso Montanari, *Paragone: Arte*, 24–5, 103–32
- Curran, Brian, Anthony Grafton, Pamela O. Long and Benjamin Weiss, 2009. *Obelisk: A History* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Dällenbach, Lucien, 1977. *Le récit spéculaire: Essai sur la mise-en-abyme* (Paris)
- Damianaki, Chrysa, Paolo Procaccioli and Angelo Romano, eds, 2006. *Ex marmore: Pasquini, pasquinisti, pasquinate nell'Europa moderna. Atti del Colloquio internazionale, Lecce–Otranto, 17–19 novembre 2005* (Rome)
- Damisch, Hubert, 1972. *Théorie du nuage pour une histoire de la peinture* (Paris)
- , 1980. 'L'alphabet des masques', *Nouvelle Revue de Psychanalyse*, 21, 93–109
- Daston, Lorraine, and Katharine Park, 1996. 'The Hermaphrodite and the Orders of Nature: Sexual Ambiguity in Early Modern France', *Premodern Sexualities*, ed. Louise Fradenburg and Carla Freccero (New York and London), 117–36
- , and ———, 1998. *Wonders and the Order of Nature* (New York)
- Deckers, Regina, 2010. *Die Testa velata in der Barockplastik: Zur Bedeutung von Schleier und Verhüllung zwischen Trauer, Allegorie und Sinnlichkeit* (Munich).
- Delbeke, Maarten, 2000. 'The Pope, the Bust, the Sculptor, and the Fly', *Bulletin de l'Institut Belge de Rome*, 70, 179–223
- , 2004a. 'Art as Evidence, Evidence as Art: Bernini, Pallavicino, and the Paradoxes of Zeno', *Estetica barocca*, ed. Sebastian Schütze (Rome), 343–59
- , 2004b. 'An Unknown Description of Baroque Rome: Michelangelo Lualdi's *Galleria Sacra Architettura dalla Pietà Romana dall'anno 1610 sino al 1645*', *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome*, 74, 61–B271.
- , 2005. 'Gianlorenzo Bernini as "la fenice degl'ingegni", or The History of an Epithet', *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, 32, 245–53
- , 2006. 'Gianlorenzo Bernini's *Bel Composto*: The Unification of Life and Work in Biography and Historiography', *Bernini's Biographies: Critical Essays*, ed. Maarten Delbeke, Evonne Levy and Steven F. Ostrow (University Park, Penn.), 251–74
- , Evonne Levy and Steven F. Ostrow, eds, 2006. *Bernini's Biographies: Critical Essays* (University Park, Penn.)
- Delumeau, Jean, 1995. *Le catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire* (1971) (Paris)
- Demisiani, G. 'Discorso sopra quattro statue del Cardinale Borghese', c.1600, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Fondo Borghese, II, 468, fols 43–66
- Dempsey, Charles, 1968. '"Et nos cedamus amori": Observations on the Farnese Gallery', *Art Bulletin*, 50, 373
- , 1995. *Annibale Carracci: The Farnese Gallery* (Rome and New York)
- Dent Weil, Phoebe, 1978. 'Bozzetto—modello: Form and Function', in Orfeo Boselli, *Osservazioni della scultura antica* (1650s) ed. Phoebe Dent Weil (Florence), 113–34

- Depping, G.-B., 1850–55. *Correspondance administrative sous le règne de Louis XIV*, 4 vols (Paris)
- Deutsche, Rosalyn, 1996. *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics* (Chicago and Cambridge, Mass.)
- Dickens, A. G., 1992. *The Counter Reformation* (1968), repr. (London)
- Didi-Huberman, Georges, 1993. 'L'autre miroir: Autoportrait et mélancolie christique selon Albrecht Dürer', *Il ritratto e la memoria*, ed. Augusto Gentili, Philippe Morel and Claudia Cieri Via, vol. 2 (Rome), 201–47
- , 1994. 'Ressemblance mythifiée et ressemblance oubliée chez Vasari: La légende du portrait "sur le vif"', *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome: Italie et Méditerranée*, 106, 383–432
- Didi-Huberman, Georges, 1999. *Ouvrir Vénus: Nudité, rêve, cruauté* (Paris)
- , 2002a. *L'image survivante: Histoire de l'art et temps des fantômes selon Aby Warburg* (Paris)
- , 2002b. 'The Surviving Images: Aby Warburg and Tylorian Anthropology', *Oxford Art Journal*, 25/1, 59–69
- , 2008. *La ressemblance par contact: Archéologie, anachronisme et modernité de l'empreinte* (Paris)
- Diez, Renato, 1997. 'Le Quarant'ore: Una predica figurata', *La festa a Roma dal Rinascimento al 1870*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo, 2 vols (Turin and Rome), 84–97 [exhibition catalogue]
- Diundam, Jeroen, 1994. *Myths of Power: Norbert Elias and the Early Modern European Court* (Amsterdam)
- Dixon Hunt, John, ed., 1992. *The Pastoral Landscape* (Washington, DC)
- Dollimore, Jonathan, 2001. *Death, Desire and Loss in Western Culture* (New York)
- Dombrowski, Damian, 1997. *Giuliano Finelli: Bildhauer zwischen Neapel und Rom* (Frankfurt)
- . *Dal trionfo all'amore: Il mutevole pensiero artistico di Gianlorenzo Bernini nella decorazione del nuovo San Pietro* (Rome)
- . 'Von der Ecclesia triumphans zur Ecclesia universalis: Zum gedanklichen Wandel in Berninis Ausstattung von St Peter', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 66, 340–92
- Donati, L., 1977. 'Un poema in lode della Galleria Borghese', *Strenna dei Romanisti*, 129–134
- Doni, Anton Francesco, 1566. *Le ville* (Bologna)
- D'Onofrio, Cesare, ed., 1963. *Fontana di Trevi: Commedia inedita* (Rome)
- , 1966. 'Un dialogo-recita di Gian Lorenzo Bernini e Lelio Guidiccioni', *Palatino*, 10, 127–34
- , 1967. *Roma vista da Roma* (Rome)
- , 1986. *Le fontane di Roma* (Rome)
- , 1990. *Un popolo di statue racconta: Storie, fatti, leggende della città di Roma, antica, medievale, moderna* (Rome)
- , 1992. *Gli obelischi di Roma: Storia e urbanistica di una città dall'età antica al XX secolo* (Rome)
- Droz, Edmond, 1958. *Automata: A Historical and Technological Study* (Neuchâtel)
- Duncan, Carole, 1995. *Civilising Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (London)
- Düring, Monika von, 2006. *Encyclopaedia anatomica: A Collection of Anatomical Waxes* (1999), new edn (London)
- Durkheim, Émile, 2008. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (1912), trans. Joseph Ward Swain (Mineola, NY)
- Eamon, William, 1991. 'Court, Academy, and Printing House: Patronage and Scientific Careers in Late Renaissance Italy', *Patronage and Institutions: Science, Technology, and Medicine at the European Court, 1500–1750*, ed. Bruce T. Moran (Rochester, NY), 25–50

- Eck, Caroline van, and Stijn Bussels, eds, 2010. *Theatricality in Early Modern Visual Art and Architecture* (*Art History*, 33/2 [special issue])
- École Française de Rome, 1981–94. *Le Palais Farnèse*, 3 vols (Rome)
- Ehrlich, Tracy, 2002. *Landscape and Identity in Early Modern Rome: Villa Culture at Frascati in the Borghese Era* (Cambridge)
- Eimer, Gerhard, 1970–1. *La fabbrica di S. Agnese in Navona: Römische Architekten, Bauherren und Handwerker im Zeitalter des Nepotismus*, 2 vols (Stockholm)
- Ekserdjian, David, 1997. *Correggio* (London and New Haven, Conn.)
- Elias, Norbert, 1994. *The Civilizing Process* (1939), trans. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford)
- , 2006. *The Court Society* (1969), trans. Edmund Jephcott, ed. Stephen Mennel (Dublin)
- Erben, Dietrich, 2004. *Paris und Rom: Die staatlich gelenkten Kunstbeziehungen unter Ludwig XIV* (Berlin)
- Erythraeus, Janus Nicius [pseud. of Giovanni Vittorio Rossi], 1645. *Pinacotheca altera*, 2 vols (Cologne)
- Evelyn, John, 1959. *Diary*, 1641–1706, ed. E. S. de Beer, 6 vols (Oxford)
- Evenett, H. O., 1968. *The Spirit of the Counter Reformation* (Cambridge)
- Fagiolo, Marcello, ed., 1997. *La festa a Roma dal Rinascimento al 1870*, 2 vols (Turin and Rome) [exhibition catalogue]
- , 1999. ‘La scena delle acque’, *Gian Lorenzo Bernini: Regista del barocco*, ed. Maria Grazia Bernardini and Maurizio Fagiolo dell’Arco (Milan), 137–82 [exhibition catalogue]
- , 2006. ‘Piazza Navona e la Fontana dei Fiumi’, *Roma barocca: Bernini, Borromini, Pietro da Cortona*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo and Paolo Portoghesi (Rome), 200–7 [exhibition catalogue]
- , and Maria Luisa Madonna, eds, 1985. *Barocco romano e barocco italiano: Il teatro, l’effimero, l’allegoria* (Rome)
- , and Paolo Portoghesi, eds, 2006. *Roma barocca: Bernini, Borromini, Pietro da Cortona* (Rome) [exhibition catalogue]
- Fagiolo dell’Arco, Maurizio, 1997a. *La festa barocca*, rev. and enlarged edn of *L’effimero barocco: Strutture della festa nella Roma del ‘600* (1977) (Rome),
- , 1997b. ‘Scultori per la festa’, *Storia dell’Arte*, 90, 162–74
- , and Silvia Carandini, 1977–8. *L’effimero barocco: Strutture della festa nella Roma del ‘600*, 2 vols (Rome)
- , and Marcello Fagiolo, 1967. *Bernini: Una introduzione al gran teatro del barocco* (Rome)
- Faldi, Italo, 1954. *Galleria Borghese: Le sculture dal secolo XVI al XIX* (Rome)
- Fantoni, Marcello, 2002. *Il potere dello spazio: principi e città nell’Italia dei secoli XV–XVII* (Rome)
- , George Gorse and Malcolm Smuts, eds, 2009. *The Politics of Space: Courts in Europe and the Mediterranean c. 1500–1750* (Rome)
- Feher, Michel, with Ramona Naddaff and Nadia Tazi, eds, 1989. *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, 3 vols (New York)
- Fehrenbach, Frank, 2005. ‘Bernini’s Light’, *Art History*, 28, 1–42
- , 2008. *Compendia mundi: Gianlorenzo Berninis Fontana dei Quattro Fiumi (1648–51) und Nicola Salvis Fontana di Trevi (1732–62)* (Munich)
- Feigenbaum, Gail, 1993. ‘Practice in the Carracci Academy’, *The Artist’s Workshop*, ed. Peter Lukehart (Washington, DC), 59–76
- Félibien, André, 1671. ‘Le portrait du Roy’ (1663), *Descriptions de divers ouvrages de peinture faits pour le roi* (Paris), 82–112

- Felman, Shoshana, 1982. 'To Open the Question', *Literature and Psychoanalysis: The Question of Reading Otherwise* (Baltimore, Md)
- Féral, Josette, 1982. 'Performance and Theatricality: The Subject Demystified', trans. Terese Lyons, *Modern Drama*, 25, 170–81
- , ed., 2002. *Theatricality (SubStance, nos. 98–99 [special issue])*
- Ferrari, Oreste, 1997. 'Poeti e scultori nella Roma seicentesca: I difficili rapporti tra due culture', *Storia dell'Arte*, 90, 151–61
- , 1999. 'Bernini e i letterati del suo tempo', *Rendiconti*, 9, 595–615
- , 2004. 'Bernini e i letterati del suo tempo', *Bernini dai Borghese ai Barberini: La cultura a Roma intorno agli anni venti*, ed. Olivier Bonfait and Anna Coliva (Rome), 59–63 [exhibition catalogue]
- Ficacci, Luigi, 1998a. 'Lanfranco e la nascita del "barocco"', *Bernini scultore: La nascita del barocco in Casa Borghese*, ed. in Anna Coliva and Sebastian Schütze (Rome), 331–88 [exhibition catalogue]
- , 1998b. 'L'espressione dell'affetto indefinite', *Docere, delectare, movere: Affetti, devozione e rettorica nel linguaggio artistico del primo barocco romano*, ed. S. De Blaauw, P.-M. Gijssbers, S. Schütze and B. Treffers (Rome), 89–104
- Findlen, Paula, 1989. 'The Museum: Its Class, Etymology and Renaissance Genealogy', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 1, 59–78
- , 1990. 'Jokes of Nature and Jokes of Knowledge: The Playfulness of Scientific Discourse in Early Modern Europe', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 43, 292–331
- , 1994. *Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy* (Berkeley, Calif.)
- , 2003. 'Scientific Spectacle in Baroque Rome: Athanasius Kircher and the Roman College Museum', *Jesuit Science and the Republic of Letters*, ed. Mordechai Feingold (Cambridge, Mass.), 225–284
- , ed., 2004. *Athanasius Kircher: The Last Man Who Knew Everything* (New York)
- Fischer, Gerhard, and Bernhard Greiner, 2007. *The Play Within the Play: The Performance of Metatheatre and Self-Reflection* (Amsterdam)
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika, 1995. 'Theatricality: A Key Concept in Theatre and Cultural Studies', *Theatre Research International*, 20/2, 85–9
- , ed., 2001. *Theorien des Performativen* (Berlin)
- Flemming, Victoria von, 1996. *Arma Amoris. Sprachbild und Bildsprache der Liebe: Kardinal Scipione Borghese und die Gemäldezyklen Francesco Albanis* (Mainz)
- Forster, Marc R., 2001. *Catholic Revival in the Age of Baroque: Religious Identity in Southwest Germany, 1550–1750* (Cambridge and New York)
- Foucault, Michel, 1966. *Les mots et les choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines* (Paris)
- Francastel, Pierre, 1965. *La réalité figurative: Éléments structurels de sociologie de l'art* (Paris)
- Francucci da Imola, Scipione. 'La galleria dell'Illustris.mo e Rev.mo S. Scipione Cardinale Borghese cantata da Scipione Francucci Arretino', 1613, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Borghesiano 184
- Fraschetti, Stanislao, 1900. *Il Bernini: La sua vita, la sua opera, il suo tempo* (Milan)
- Frazer, James Gordon, 1994. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion* (1890), abridged edn (London and New York)
- Freud, Sigmund, 1975. *Civilisation and its Discontents* (1930), trans. Joan Riviere, rev edn, ed. James Strachey (London)
- Fried, Michael, 1980. *Absorption and Theatricality: Painter and Beholder in the Age of Diderot*, (New Haven, Conn.)
- , 1988. *Art and Objecthood: Essays and Reviews* (Chicago)
- , 2006. 'Absorbed in the Action', review of *Zidane: A 21st-century Portrait* (film), *Artforum International*, September, 333–5, 398

- Fry, Roger, 1926. *Transformations* (London)
- Fumagalli, Elena, 1994. *Palazzo Borghese: Committenza e decorazione privata* (Rome)
- Fumaroli, Marc, 1982. 'Muta eloquentia: La représentation de l'éloquence dans l'œuvre de Nicolas Poussin,' *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art Français*, 29–48
- , 1988. 'La galleria de Marino et la Galerie Farnèse: Epigrammes et œuvres d'art profane vers 1600', *Les Carraches et les décors profanes: Actes du colloque organisé par l'École Française de Rome*, 2–4 octobre 1986 (Rome), 163–82
- , 1992. *Genre des genres littéraires français: La conversation* (Oxford)
- , 1994. *L'école du silence: Le sentiment des images au XVIIe siècle* (Paris)
- , 1999. 'The Fertility and the Shortcomings of Renaissance Rhetoric: The Jesuit Case', *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences and the Arts, 1540–1773*, ed. John W. O'Malley et al., (Toronto), 3–37
- Furttenbach, Joseph, 1627. *Newer itinerarium italiae* (Ulm)
- Gaddo, Beata di, 1985. *Villa Borghese: Il giardino e le architetture* (Rome)
- , 1997. *L'architettura di Villa Borghese: Dal giardino private al parco pubblico* (Rome).
- Gaskell, Ivan, and Henry Lie, eds, 1999. *Sketches in Clay for Projects by Gian Lorenzo Bernini: Theoretical, Technical, and Case Studies* (*Harvard University Art Museums Bulletin*, 6/3)
- Geertz, Clifford, 1980. *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-Century Bali* (Princeton, NJ)
- Gell, Alfred, 1992. *The Anthropology of Time: Cultural Constructions of Temporal Maps and Images* (Oxford)
- , 1998. *Art and Agency: Towards a New Anthropological Theory* (Oxford)
- Gentili, Augusto, Philippe Morel and Claudia Cieri Via, eds, 1993. *Il ritratto e la memoria*, vol. 3, (Rome)
- Gerardi, Antonio, 1608. 'Relatione del solenne apparato fatto dagli illustriss. Signori della Congregatione della Beatissima Vergine Assunta nella chiesa della casa professa del Giesù', Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, Archivium Romanum Societas Iesu
- , 1644. *Trionfal possesso della santità di N.S. Innocentio X alla sacrosanta Basilica Lateranense* (Rome)
- Gibson-Wood, Carol, 1988. *Studies in the Theory of Connoisseurship from Vasari to Morelli* (New York)
- Giesey, Ralph, 2004. *Rulership in France, 15th to 17th Centuries* (Aldershot)
- Gigli, Giacinto, 1994. *Diario di Roma, 1608–44*, ed. Manlio Barberito, 2 vols (Rome)
- Gilbert, Creighton, 1995. *Caravaggio and his Two Cardinals* (University Park, Penn.)
- Gillgren, Peter, and Marten Snickare, eds, 2012. *Performativity and Performance in Baroque Rome* (Farnham)
- Ginzburg, Silvia, 2000. *Annibale Carracci a Roma: Gli affreschi di Palazzo Farnese* (Rome)
- , 2008. *La Galleria Farnese: Gli affreschi dei Carracci* (Milan)
- Giovanni, Cristina, 1997. *Pasquino e le statue parlanti* (Rome)
- Gioya, Antonio da Bernal de, 1651. *Copiosissimo discorso della fontana e guglia eretta in Piazza Navona* (Rome)
- Giraud, Yves, 1969. *La fable de Daphné* (Geneva)
- Giuliano, Antonio, 1992. *La collezione Boncompagni Ludovisi: Algardi, Bernini, e la fortuna dell'antico* (Venice)
- Gnoli, Domenico, 1890. 'Le origini di maestro Pasquino', *Nuova Antologia*, 3rd ser., 25
- Goffman, Erving, 1981. *Forms of Talk* (Oxford)
- Goldsmith, E. C., 1988. *Exclusive Conversations: The Art of Interaction in Seventeenth-Century France* (Philadelphia)
- Gombrich, Ernst, 1966. 'Ritualised Gesture and Expression in Art', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 251, 393–401; repr. in *The Image and the Eye* (Oxford, 1982)
- Gould, Cecil, 1976. *The Paintings of Correggio* (London)
- , 1982. *Bernini in France: An Episode in Seventeenth-Century History* (Princeton, NJ)

- Grassi, Luigi, 1984 'Gian Lorenzo Bernini e Fréart de Chantelou, Salvator Rosa e Nicolò Simonelli: Due accademie e una caricatura', *Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Federico Zeri*, ed. Mauro Natale, 2 vols (Milan), vol. 2, 630–9
- Grazia, Diane de, 1995. 'Drawings as Means to an End: Preparatory Methods in the Carracci School', *The Craft of Art: Originality and Industry in the Italian Renaissance and Baroque Workshop*, ed. Andrew Ladis and Carolyn Wood (Athens and London), 165–86
- Greenblatt, Stephen, 1991. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Oxford)
- Gregori, Luigi de, 1926. *Piazza Navona prima d'Innocenzo X* (Rome)
- Gregori, Mina, ed., 1991. *Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio: Come nascono i capolavori* (Florence, Rome and Milan) [exhibition catalogue]
- Grendler, Paul, 1989. *Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning* (Baltimore, Md)
- Griffey, Erin, 1999. 'The Artist's Stage: The Schilderkamer as a Site of Play in the 17th Century', *Zeventiende Eeuw*, 15, 48–60
- Griffin, Tim. 'The Job Changes You', review of *Zidane: A 21st-century Portrait* (film), *Artforum International*, September, 336–8
- Grisebach, August, 1936. *Römische Porträtbusten der Gegenreformation* (Leipzig)
- Hagstrum, Jean H., 1958. *The Sister Arts: The Tradition of Literary Pictorialism and English Poetry from Dryden to Gray* (Chicago)
- Halbwachs, Maurice, 1980. *The Collective Memory* (1950), trans. Francis J Ditter, Jr, and Vida Yazdi Ditter (New York)
- Hamburger, Jeffrey, 1998. *The Visual and the Visionary: Art and Female Spirituality in Late Medieval Germany* (New York)
- Hammond, Frederick, 1985. 'Bernini and the "Fiera di Farfa"', *Gianlorenzo Bernini: New Aspects of his Art and Thought*, ed. Irving Lavin (University Park, Penn., and London), 115–178
- Hankins, James, 1991. 'The Myth of the Platonic Academy of Florence', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 44, 429–75
- Harvey, David, and Edward Soja, 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London)
- Haskell, Francis, 1980. *Patrons and Painters: A Study in the Relations between Italian Art and Society in the Age of the Baroque* (1963), rev. and enlarged edn (New Haven, Conn.)
- , and Nicholas Penny, 1981. *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500–1900* (New Haven, Conn.)
- Hayden, Dolores, 1995. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, Mass., and London)
- Heathfield, Adrian, ed., 2004. *Live: Art and Performance* (London)
- Hécaen, Henri, 1971. 'La sémiotique non linguistique', *Essais de sémiotique*, ed. Julia Kristeva (Paris)
- Hecht, Christian, 2003. *Die Glorie: Begriff, Thema, Bildelement in der europäischen Sakralkunst vom Mittelalter bis zum Ausgang des Barock* (Regensburg)
- Heller, Wendy, 2010. 'Dancing Statues and the Myth of Venice: Ancient Sculpture on the Opera Stage', *Theatricality in Early Modern Visual Art and Architecture*, ed. Caroline van Eck and Stijn Bussels, 304–19 (*Art History*, 33/2 [special issue])
- Hénin, Emmanuelle, 2003. *Ut pictura theatrum: Théâtre et peinture de la Renaissance italienne au classicisme français* (Geneva)
- , 2010. 'Parrhasios and the Stage Curtain: Theatre, Metapainting and the Idea of Representation in the Seventeenth Century', *Theatricality in Early Modern Visual Art and Architecture*, ed. Caroline van Eck and Stijn Bussels, 248–61 (*Art History*, 33/2 [special issue])

- Henry, Christophe, 2007. 'Le roi, le peintre et le chef-d'œuvre: Le rôle de l'imitation des maîtres dans l'invention de l'image de Louis XIII', *L'image du roi de François Ier à Louis XIV*, ed. Thomas W. Gaetgens and Nicole Hochner (Paris), 401–32
- Hermans, Lex, 2010. 'The Performing Venue: The Visual Play of Italian Courtly Theatres in the Sixteenth Century', *Theatricality in Early Modern Visual Art and Architecture*, ed. Caroline van Eck and Stijn Bussels, 292–303 (*Art History*, 33/2 [special issue])
- Herrmann Fiore, Kristina, 1997a. 'Apollo e Dafne del Bernini al tempo del Cardinale Scipione Borghese', *Apollo e Dafne del Bernini nella Galleria Borghese*, ed. Kristina Herrmann Fiore (Milan), 71–109
- , ed., 1997b. *Apollo e Dafne del Bernini nella Galleria Borghese* (Milan)
- , 2008. 'The Exhibition of Sculpture on the Villa Borghese Facades in the Time of Cardinal Scipione Borghese', *Collecting Sculpture in Early Modern Europe*, eds Nicholas Penny and Eike D. Schmidt (New Haven, Conn.), 219–45
- Hess, Catherine, 2009. 'Speaking Likeness', *I marmi vivi: Bernini e la nascita del ritratto barocco*, ed. Andrea Bacchi, Tomaso Montanari, Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi and Dimitrios Zikos (Florence and Milan), 165–79 [exhibition catalogue]
- Hewitt, Barnard, ed., 1958. *The Renaissance Stage: Documents of Serlio, Sabbattini, and Furttenbach*, trans. Allardyce Nicoll, John H. McDowell and George R. Kernodle (Coral Gables, Fla)
- Hibbard, Howard, 1958. 'Nuove note sul Bernini', *Bolletino d'Arte*, 43, 181–83
- , 1965. *Bernini* (London)
- , 1983. *Caravaggio* (London)
- Higgins, Lynn A., and Brenda R. Silver, eds, 1991. *Rape and Representation* (New York)
- Hills, Helen, ed., 2011. *Rethinking the Baroque* (Aldershot)
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds, 1992. *The Invention of Tradition* (1983), new edn (Cambridge)
- Hook, Judith, 1977. 'Urban VIII: The paradox of a spiritual monarchy', *The Courts of Europe: Politics, Patronage and Royalty, 1400–1800*, ed. A. G. Dickens (London), 213–32
- Horn-Monval, Madeleine, 1957. 'La grande machinerie théâtrale et ses origines', *Revue d'Histoire du Théâtre*, 4, 291–308
- Houghton, Walter, 1942. 'The English Virtuoso in the Seventeenth Century', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 3 (Part 1) 51–73; (Part 2) 190–219
- Houseman, Michael, and Carlo Severi, 1998. *Naven, or, The Other Self: A Relational Approach to Ritual Action*, trans. Michael Fineberg (Leiden)
- Hughes, Anthony, 1990. 'The Cave and the Stithy: Artists' Studios and Intellectual Property in Early Modern Europe', *Oxford Art Journal*, 13, 34–48
- Hughes, J. Donald, 1994. *Pan's Travail: Environmental Problems of the Ancient Greeks and Romans* (Baltimore, Md)
- Hugo, Herman, 1624. *Pia desideria* (Antwerp)
- Humfrey, Peter, and Martin Kemp, eds, 1990. *The Altarpiece in the Renaissance* (Cambridge)
- Huse, Norbert, 1970. 'La fontaine des fleuves du Bernin', *Revue de l'Art*, 7, 7–17
- Ignatius of Loyola, 1979. *Spiritual Exercises* (1524), trans. Thomas Corbishley (Chichester)
- Imorde, Joseph, 1997. Präsenz und Repräsentanz, oder, Die Kunst, den Leib Christi auszustellen (das vierzigstündige Gebet von den Anfängen bis in das Pontifikat Innocenz X.) (Emsdetten)
- , 1998. 'Francesco Barberini, Vice-Chancellor: The Quarant'ore Decorations in San Lorenzo in Damaso of 1633', *Pietro da Cortona: Atti del Convegno internazionale, Roma–Firenze, 12–15 novembre 1997*, ed. Christoph Luitpold Frommel and Sebastian Schütze (Milan), 189–200

- Impey, Oliver, and Arthur MacGregor, eds, 2001. *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe* (1985), 2nd edn (London)
- Ingersoll, Richard, 1985. 'The Ritual Use of Public Space in Renaissance Rome', PhD, University of California, Berkeley
- Iversen, Erik, 1968. *Obelisks in Exile*, vol. 1: *The Obelisks of Rome* (Copenhagen)
- , 1993. *The Myth of Egypt in the European Tradition* (1961), pbk edn (Princeton, NJ)
- Jacobs, Fredrika H., 2005. *The Living Image in Renaissance Art* (Cambridge)
- Jarrard, Alice, 2002. 'Inventing in Bernini's Shop in the Late 1660s: Projects for Cardinal Rinaldo d'Este', *Burlington Magazine*, 144, 409–19
- , 2003. *Architecture as Performance in Seventeenth-Century Europe: Court Ritual in Modena, Rome, and Paris* (Cambridge and New York)
- Jedin, Hubert, and John Dolan, eds, 1980. *History of the Church*, vol. 5: *Reformation and Counter Reformation* (New York)
- Jollet, Étienne, 2007. 'L'œil du prince: Le regard dans les portraits royaux par Jean et François Clouet', *L'image du roi de François Ier à Louis XIV*, eds Thomas W. Gaechtgens and Nicole Hochner (Paris), 343–58
- Jouin, Henry, 1883. *Conférences de l'Académie Royale de Peinture et Sculpture* (Paris)
- Jungmann, Joseph, 1950. *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*, 2 vols (New York)
- Kalveram, Katrin, 1995. *Die Antikensammlung des Kardinals Scipione Borghese*, Römische Studien der Bibliotheca Hertziana (Worms)
- Kantorowicz, Ernst, 1957. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ)
- Katritzky, M. A., 2006. *The Art of Commedia: A Study in the Commedia dell'Arte, 1560–1620, with Special Reference to the Visual Records* (Amsterdam and New York)
- Kendon, Adam, 2004. *Gesture: Visible Action as Utterance* (Cambridge)
- Kenseth, Joy, 1981. 'Bernini's Borghese Sculptures: Another View', *Art Bulletin*, 63, 191–210
- , ed., 1991. *The Age of the Marvelous* (Hanover, NH) [exhibition catalogue, Hood Museum of Art]
- Kertzer, David, 1988. *Rituals, Politics, and Power* (New Haven and London)
- Kircher, Athanasius, 1650. *Obeliscus Pamphilius* (Rome)
- Kirsch, James, 1987. 'Clouds', *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Mircea Eliade (London), vol. 3, 546–7
- Kirwin, W. Chandler, 1997. *Powers Matchless: The Pontificate of Urban VIII, the Baldachin, and Gian Lorenzo Bernini* (New York)
- Kitao, Timothy K., 1974. *Circle and Oval in the Square of Saint Peter's: Bernini's Art of Planning* (New York)
- Knox, Dilwyn, 1996. 'Giovanni Bonifacio's L'arte de' cenni and Renaissance Ideas of Gesture', *Italia ed Europa nella Linguistica del Rinascimento: Confronti e relazioni. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Ferrara, Palazzo Paradiso, 20–24 marzo 1991*, ed. Mirko Tavoni, 2 vols (Modena), vol. 2, 379–400
- Kommer, Björn R., 1974. *Nicodemus Tessin der Jüngere und das Stockholmer Schloss: Untersuchungen zum Hauptwerk des schwedischen Architekten* (Heidelberg)
- Krautheimer, Richard, 1982. *Roma Alessandrina: The Remapping of Rome under Alexander VII, 1655–1667* (Poughkeepsie, NY)
- , 1985. *The Rome of Alexander VII* (Princeton, NJ)
- , and Roger B. S. Jones, 1975. 'The Diary of Alexander VII: Notes on Art, Artists and Buildings', *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 15, 199–236
- Kris, Ernst, and Otto Kurz, 1979. *Legend, Myth, and Magic in the Image of the Artist* (New Haven)

- Kristeva, Julia, 2008. *Thérèse mon amour. Récit: Sainte Thérèse d'Avila* (Paris)
- Kross, Matthias, 1985. 'Gian Lorenzo Bernini: Die Verzückung der Heiligen Theresia', *Der Betrachter ist im Bild: Kunstwissenschaft und Rezeptionsästhetik*, ed. Wolfgang Kemp (Cologne), 137–53
- Kruse, Christiane, 2006. 'Parer viva oder die Kunst der (dis)simulazione im Barock: Zu Gian Lorenzo Berninis Apoll und Daphne in der Galleria Borghese', *Skulptur: Zwischen Realität und Virtualität*, ed. Gundolf Winter, Jens Schröter and Christian Spies (Munich), 155–76
- Kuspit, Donald, 1992. 'Magic Kingdom of the Museum', *Artforum* (April), 58–63
- Lacan, Jacques, 1972–3. *On Feminine Sexuality: The Limits of Love and Knowledge*, trans. Bruce Fink (*Séminaire*, Book 20: *Encore*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller) (New York and London)
- Lairesse, Gérard de, 1707. *Het groot schilderboek* (Amsterdam)
- Laurain-Portemer, Madeleine, 1981–97. *Études Mazarines*, 2 vols (Paris)
- , 1987. 'Fortuna e sfortuna di Bernini nella Francia di Mazzarino', *Gian Lorenzo Bernini e le arti visive*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo (Rome), vol. 2, 113–38
- Lavin, Irving, 1964. Review of Cesare D'Onofrio, ed., *Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Fontana di Trevi: Commedia inedita* (Rome, 1963), *Art Bulletin*, 46, 568–72
- , 1967. 'Bozzetti and Modelli: Notes on Sculptural Procedure from the Early Renaissance through Bernini', *Akten des 21. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte, 1964: Stil und Überlieferung* (Berlin), vol. 3, 93–104
- , 1968a. *Bernini and the Crossing of St Peter's* (New York)
- , 1968b. 'Five New Youthful Sculptures by Gianlorenzo Bernini and a Revised Chronology of his Early Works', *Art Bulletin* 50, 223–48
- , 1978. 'Calculated Spontaneity: Bernini and the Terracotta Sketch', *Apollo*, 107, 398–405
- , 1980. *Bernini and the Unity of the Visual Arts*, 2 vols (New York and London)
- , 1981a. 'Bernini and the Art of Social Satire', *Drawings by Gianlorenzo Bernini from the Museum der Bildenden Künste Leipzig*, ed. Irving Lavin (Leipzig and Princeton NJ), 25–55
- , ed., 1981b. *Drawings by Gianlorenzo Bernini from the Museum der Bildenden Künste* (Leipzig and Princeton, NJ)
- , 1989. 'Bernini and Antiquity. The Baroque Paradox: A Political View', *Antikenrezeption im Hochbarock*, ed. Herbert Beck and Sabine Schulze (Berlin), 109–28
- , 1990. 'High and Low before their Time: Bernini and the Art of Social Satire', *Modern Art and Popular Culture: Readings in High and Low*, ed. Kirk Varnedoe and Adam Gopnik (New York), 19–50; repubd in *Visible Spirit: The Art of Gianlorenzo Bernini*, vol. 1 (London, 2007), 397–468
- , 1993. 'Bernini's Image of the Sun King', *Past-Present: Essays on Historicism in Art from Donatello to Picasso* (Berkeley, Calif., and Los Angeles)
- , 1998a. *Bernini e l'immagine del principe cristiano ideale*, with documentary appendix by Giorgia Mancini (Modena)
- , 1998b. 'Il busto di Francesco I d'Este di Bernini: "Impresa quasi impossibile"', *Sovrane passione: Le raccolte d'arte della Ducale Galleria Estense* (Milan), 86–99 [exhibition catalogue]
- , 1999. 'Bernini's Image of the Ideal Christian Monarch', *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773*, ed. John W. O'Malley et al. (Toronto), 442–79
- , 2007. 'Urbanitas urbana: The Pope, the Artist, and the Genius of the Place', *I Barberini e la cultura europea del seicento*, ed. Lorenza Mochi Onori, Sebastian Schütze and Francesco Solinas (Rome), 15–30
- , 2007–. *Visible Spirit: The Art of Gianlorenzo Bernini*, 3 vols (London): vol. 1 (2007); vol. 2 (2009)

- , 2008. 'The Baldacchino. Borromini vs Bernini: Did Borromini forget himself?', *Sankt Peter in Rom, 1506–2006: Beiträge der internationalen Tagung vom 22.–25. Februar 2006 in Bonn*, ed. Georg Satzinger and Sebastian Schütze (Munich), 275–300
- Lea, K. M., 1934. *Italian Popular Comedy: A Study in the Commedia dell'Arte, 1560–1620, with Special Reference to the English Stage*, 2 vols (Oxford)
- Leach, E. R., 1961. 'Two Essays Concerning the Symbolic Representation of Time', *Rethinking Anthropology* (London), 124–136
- Lefebvre, Henri, 1974. *La production de l'espace* (Paris)
- , 1991. *The Production of Space* (1974), trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford)
- Lehmann, Ann-Sophie, and Herman Roodenburg, 2008. *Body and Embodiment in Netherlandish Art* (Zwolle) (*Netherlands Yearbook for History of Art*, 58, 2007–08)
- Lehmann, Claudia, 2010. 'Un pien teatro di meraviglie': Gian Lorenzo Bernini vor dem Hintergrund konzeptistischer Emblematik (Bern)
- Le Moyne, Pierre, 1665. *De l'art de regner* (XXXXX)
- Leone, Stephanie, 2008. *Palazzo Pamphili in Piazza Navona: Constructing Identity in Early Modern Rome* (London)
- Leopold, Silke, 1991. *Monteverdi: Music in Transition* (Oxford)
- Le Pas de Sécheval, Anne, 1995. 'Le Cardinal de Richelieu, le théâtre et les décorateurs italiens: Nouveaux documents sur Mirame et le ballet de La Prospérité des Armes de France' (1641), *XVIIe Siècle*, 186, 135–46
- Leporeo, Ludovico, 1628. 'Villa Borghese', Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Fondo Borghese, I, 425bis
- Longhi, Roberto, 1928. *Precisioni nelle gallerie italiane*, vol. 1: *R. Galleria Borghese* (Rome)
- Lotz, Wolfgang, 1973. 'Gli 883 cocchi della Roma del 1594', *Studi offerti a Giovanni Incisa della Rocchetta*, Miscellanea della Società Romana di Storia Patria, 23, 247–66
- Lualdi, Michelangelo, 1651a. *Descrittione della Fontana Pamphilia, dove fu già il Cerchio Agonale* (Rome)
- , 1651b. *Istoria ecclesiastica*, vol. 2: *La propagatione del Vangelo nell'Occidente*, (Rome)
- Lucian of Samosata, 1905, 'The Hall', *Complete Works*, trans. H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler, 4 vols (Oxford), 12–23
- Lukehart, Peter, ed., 1993. *The Artist's Workshop* (Hanover, NH)
- McClary, Susan, 2002. 'Constructions of Gender in Monteverdi's Dramatic Music', *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality* (1991), new edn (Minneapolis), 35–52
- , 2004. *Modal Subjectivities: Self-Fashioning in the Italian Madrigal* (Berkeley, Calif.)
- McGowan, Margaret M., 2002. 'The Renaissance Triumph and its Classical Heritage', *Court Festivals of the European Renaissance: Art, Politics and Performance*, ed. J. R. Mulryne and Elizabeth Goldring (Aldershot), 26–47
- McPhee, Sarah, 2000. 'Bernini's Books', *Burlington Magazine*, 142, 442–8
- , 2002. *Bernini and the Bell Towers: Architecture and Politics at the Vatican* (New Haven, Conn., and London)
- Maffei, Paolo Alessandro, 1713. *Raccolta di statue antiche e moderne data in luce sotto i gloriosi auspici della Santità di N.S. Papa Clemente XI* (Rome)
- Magendie, Maurice, 1925. *La politesse mondaine et les théories de l'honnêteté en France au XVIIe siècle, de 1600 à 1660* (Paris)
- Mahon, Denis, 1947. *Studies in Seicento Art and Theory* (London)
- Mâle, Émile, 1932. *L'art religieux après le Concile de Trente* (Paris)
- Malvasia, Carlo Cesare, 1678. *Felsina Pittrice*, 2 vols (Bologna)
- Man, Paul de, 1979. *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke, and Proust* (New Haven, Conn., and London)
- Mancini, Giulio, 1956–7. *Considerazioni sulla pittura* (c. 1620), ed. Adriana Marucchi, 2 vols (Rome)

- Manilli, Jacopo, 1650. *Villa Borghese fuori di Porta Pinciana* (Rome)
- Marder, Tod, 1998. *Bernini and the Art of Architecture* (New York)
- , 1999. 'Il parere di Gian Lorenzo Bernini', *Modena 1598: L'invenzione di una capitale*, ed. C. Conforti, G. Curcio and M. Bulgarelli (Milan), 125–27
- , 2000. 'Borromini e Bernini a Piazza Navona', *Francesco Borromini: Atti del Convegno internazionale, Roma, 13–15 gennaio 2000*, ed. Christoph Luitpold Frommel and Elisabeth Sladek (Rome), 140–45
- Marin, Louis, 1978. 'Représentation et simulacre', *Critique* (June–July), 373–4, 534–44
- , 1988a. 'Mimésis et description', *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Word & Image / Actes du Premier congrès international de texte et image*, 25–36 (*Word & Image*, 4/1 [special issue])
- , 1988b. *Portrait of the King* (1981), trans. Martha M. Houle (Minnesota)
- , 1992a. 'Mimesis and Description: From Curiosity to Method, from the Age of Montaigne to the Age of Descartes', *Documentary Culture: Florence and Rome from Grand Duke Ferdinand I to Pope Alexander VII*, ed. Elizabeth Cropper, Giovanna Perini and Francesco Solinas, Florence, 1992, 23–47
- , 1992b. 'Reflexions après une rencontre. L'Italie tridentine: Une civilisation de l'otium', *Documentary Culture: Florence and Rome from Grand Duke Ferdinand I to Pope Alexander VII*, ed. Elizabeth Cropper, Giovanna Perini and Francesco Solinas (Florence), 391–406
- , 1995. *Sublime Poussin* (Paris)
- , 2001a. 'The Pleasures of Narration', *On Representation* (1994), trans. Catherine Porter (Stanford, Calif), 153–72
- , 2001b. 'Representation and Simulacrum', *On Representation* (1994), trans. Catherine Porter (Stanford, Calif.), 309–19
- Marini, Maurizio, 1987. *Caravaggio: Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio 'pictor praestantissimus'* (Rome)
- Marino, Giambattista, 1608. *La Murtoleide* (n.p.)
- , 1619. *La galleria del cavalier Marino: distinta in pitture e sculture* (Venice)
- Martin, J. R., 1965. *The Farnese Gallery* (Princeton, NJ)
- Martinelli, Valentino, 1996. *L'ultimo Bernini, 1665–1680: Nuovi argomenti, documenti, e immagini* (Rome)
- Marucci, Valerio, 1988. *Pasquinate del cinque e seicento* (Rome)
- Marx, Karl, 1983. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, ed. Frederick Engels (1887), repr. (London)
- Maylender, Michele, 1976. *Storia delle accademie d'Italia*, 5 vols (Bologna)
- Mazzocchi, Giacomo, 1510. *Carmina ad Pasquillum posita* (Rome)
- Meli, Emilio, 1652. *La Fontana Pamfilia* (Rome)
- Menichella, Anna, 1985. *Matthia de' Rossi, discepolo prediletto del Bernini* (Rome)
- Menniti Ippolito, Antonio, 2002. 'The Secretariat of State as the Pope's Special Ministry', *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492–1700*, ed. G. Signorotto and M. A. Visceglia (Cambridge and New York), 99–131
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, 1962. *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Colin Smith (London)
- Michel, Christian, 2002. 'Le chevalier Bernin et l'enseignement artistique en France', *Le Bernin et l'Europe: Du baroque triomphant à l'âge romantique*, eds Chantal Grell and Milovan Stani (Paris), 93–106
- Mignot, Claude, 1999. 'Urban Transformations', *The Triumph of the Baroque: Architecture in Europe, 1600–1750*, ed. Henry A. Millon (London), 315–32
- Millon, Henry A., ed., 1999. *The Triumph of the Baroque: Architecture in Europe, 1600–1750* (London)
- Mirollo, James, 1963. *The Poet of the Marvelous: Giambattista Marino* (New York)

- Mirot, Léon, 1904. 'Le Bernin en France: Les travaux du Louvre et les statues de Louis XIV', *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris*, 31, 161–288
- Mitchell, W. J. T., 2002a, 'Imperial Landscape', *Landscape and Power*, ed. W. J. T. Mitchell (Chicago), 5–34
- , ed., 2002b, *Landscape and Power* (Chicago)
- Montagu, Jennifer, 1985. 'Bernini Sculptures not by Bernini', *Gianlorenzo Bernini: New Aspects of his Art and Thought*, ed. Irving Lavin (University Park, Penn., and London), 25–62
- , 1986. 'Disegni, bozzetti, legnetti and modelli in Roman Seicento Sculpture', *Entwurf und Ausführung in der europäischen Barockplastik. Beiträge zum internationalen Kolloquium des Bayerischen Nationalmuseums und des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1985*, ed. Peter Volk (Munich), 9–30
- , 1989. *Roman Baroque Sculpture: The Industry of Art* (London and New Haven, Conn.)
- , 1994. *The Expression of the Passions: The Origin and Influence of Charles Le Brun's Conférence sur l'expression générale et particulière* (New Haven, Conn., and London)
- , 1996. *Gold, Silver and Bronze: Metal Sculpture of the Roman Baroque*, The A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, 1990, Bollingen Series XXXV, 39 (Princeton, NJ)
- Montaignon, M. A. de, 1875. *Procès-verbaux de l'Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, 1648–1792*, 10 vols (Paris)
- Montanari, Tomaso, 1997, 'Gian Lorenzo Bernini e Sforza Pallavicino', *Prospettiva*, 87–8, 42–68
- , 1998a. 'Alle origini della storiografia berniniana', in Alessandro Angelini, *Gian Lorenzo Bernini e i Chigi tra Roma e Siena* (Siena), 330–477
- , 1998b 'Sulla fortuna poetica di Bernini: Frammenti del tempo di Alessandro VII e di Sforza Pallavicino', *Studi Secenteschi*, 39, 127–64
- , 1999. 'Pierre Cureau de La Chambre e la prima biografia di Gian Lorenzo Bernini', *Paragone: Arte*, 24–5, 103–132
- , 2000. 'Tribuna, Gian Lorenzo Bernini' *La Basilica di San Pietro in Vaticano*, ed. Antonio Pinelli, 4 vols (Modena), vol. 2, 615–24
- , 2003a. 'Bernini e Rembrandt: il teatro e la pittura. Per una rilettura degli autoritratti berniniani', *Bernini e la pittura*, ed. Daniela Gallavotti Cavallero (Rome), 187–202
- , 2003b. 'A Contemporary Reading of Bernini's "Maraviglioso Composto": Unpublished Poems on the Four River Fountain and the Cornaro Chapel', *Poetry on Art: Renaissance to Romanticism*, ed. Thomas Frangenberg (Donington, Lincs.), 177–89
- , 2004a. "“Dar todo a uno es obra del diablo”": Gian Lorenzo Bernini artista di corte?', *Velázquez, Bernini, Luca Giordano: Le corti del barocco*, ed. Fernando Checa Cremades, (Geneva and Milan), 225–60 [exhibition catalogue]
- , 2004b. "“Theatralia”, di Giovan Battista Doni: Una nuova fonte per il teatro di Bernini', *Estetica barocca*, ed. Sebastian Schütze (Rome), 301–20
- , 2005a. 'Il "bel composto": Nota filologica su un nodo della storiografia berniniana', *Studi Secenteschi*, 46, 195–210
- , 2005b. 'Percorsi per cinquant'anni di studi berniniani', *Studiolo*, 3, 269–98
- , 2006. 'At the Margins of the Historiography of Art: The Vite of Bernini between Autobiography and Apologia', *Bernini's Biographies: Critical Essays*, ed. Maarten Delbeke, Evonne Levy and Steven F. Ostrow (University Park, Penn.), 73–110
- , 2007a. *Bernini pittore* (Milan) [exhibition catalogue, Palazzo Barberini, Rome]
- , 2007b. 'Bernini pittore', *Bernini pittore* (Milan) [exhibition catalogue, Palazzo Barberini, Rome], 20–86
- , 2009. 'Il colore del marmo: I busti di Bernini tra scultura e pittura, ritratto e storia, funzione e stile', *I marmi vivi: Bernini e la nascita del ritratto barocco*, ed. Andrea Bacchi, Tomaso Montanari, Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi and Dimitrios Zikos (Florence and Milan), 71–136 [exhibition catalogue]

- Montanelli, Indro, 1970. *Piazza Navona: Isola dei Pamphili* (Rome)
- Montelatici, Domenico, 1700. *Villa Borghese fuori di Porta Pinciana* (Rome)
- Morello, Giovanni, ed., 1993. *Vatican Treasures: 2000 Years of Art and Culture in the Vatican and Italy* (Milan and New York) [exhibition catalogue]
- Mormando, Franco, 2011a. *Bernini: His Life and his Rome* (Chicago)
- , ed., 2011b. *Domenico Bernini: The Life of Gianlorenzo Bernini* (Philadelphia)
- Muller, Jeffrey, 1989. *Rubens: The Artist as Collector* (Princeton, NJ)
- Mumford, Lewis, 1961. *The City in History: Its Origins, its Transformations, and its Prospects* (New York)
- Napoleone, Caterina, 1996. 'La trasverberazione di Teresa: La Capella Cornaro del Bernini', *FMR, Edizione italiana*, 119, 17–44
- , 1998. 'Bernini e il cantiere della Capella Cornaro', *Studi sul Settecento*, vol. 1, Antologia di Belle Arti, new ser. (Turin), 172–86
- Negro, Angela, 2002. *Bernini e il bel composto: La cappella de Sylva in Sant'Isidoro* (Rome)
- Noehles, Karl, 1969. 'Architekturprojekte Cortonas', *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, 20, 171–206
- , 1970. *La chiesa dei SS Luca e Martina nell'opera di Pietro da Cortona* (Rome)
- , 1982. 'Scenografie per le Quarant'ore e altari barocchi', *La scenografia barocca. Atti del XXIV Congresso internazionale di storia dell'arte*, 5, ed. Antoine Schnapper (Bologna), 151–5
- , 1985a. 'Apparati berniniani per canonizzazioni', *Barocco romano e barocco italiano: Il teatro, l'effimero, l'allegoria*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna (Rome), 100–8
- , 1985b. 'Teatri per le Quarant'ore e altari barocchi', *Barocco romano e barocco italiano: Il teatro, l'effimero, l'allegoria*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna (Rome), 88–99
- Noferi, Adelia, 1974. 'Il canzoniere del Petrarca: Scrittura del desiderio e desiderio della scrittura', *Paragone: Letteratura*, 25, 3–24
- Nora, Pierre, 1989. 'Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*', *Representations*, 26, 7–12
- , ed., 1998. *Realms of Memory* (1992), 3 vols, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (New York)
- Norman, Larry F., 2001. *The Theatrical Baroque* (Chicago)
- Norton, David, ed., 2005. *The New Cambridge Paragraph Bible* (Cambridge)
- Nussdorfer, Laurie, 1992. *Civic Politics in the Rome of Urban VIII* (Princeton, NJ)
- , 1997. 'The Politics of Space in Early Modern Rome', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 42, 161–86
- Olin, Margaret, 1992. *Forms of Representation in Alois Riegl's Theory of Art*, (University Park, Penn.)
- O'Malley, John W., 1999. 'A Historiographical Frame for the Paintings: Recent Interpretations of Early Modern Catholicism', *Saints and Sinners: Caravaggio and the Baroque Image*, ed. Franco Mormando (Chicago) [exhibition catalogue]
- , 2000. *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- , and Gauvin Alexander Bailey, eds, 2005. *The Jesuits and the Arts, 1540–1773* (Philadelphia)
- , et al., eds, 1999–2006. *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773*, 2 vols (Toronto)
- Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong, 1973. *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, 2 vols (London, Berkeley, Calif., and Los Angeles)
- Orsini, P. G., Duke of Bracciano, 1648. *Parallelo fra la città e la villa: Satire undici* (Bracciano)

- Ostrow, Steven F., 2004. 'Playing with the *Paragone*: The Reliefs of Pietro Bernini', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 67, 329–64
- , 2006. 'Bernini's Voice: From Chantelou's Journal to the Vite', *Bernini's Biographies: Critical Essays*, eds Maarten Delbeke, Evonne Levy and Steven F. Ostrow (University Park, Penn.), 111–42
- , 2007. 'Bernini e il paragone tra pittura e scultura', *Bernini pittore*, ed. Tomaso Montanari (Milan), 223–33
- Ottonelli, G. D., 1648. *Della christiana moderazione del teatro* (Florence)
- , 1661. *L'arte gesticolatoria* (n.p.)
- , and Pietro Berrettini, 1973. *Trattato della pittura e scultura* (1652), ed. Vittorio Casale (Rome)
- Ovid, 2004. *Metamorphoses*, trans. David Raeburn (London)
- Panofsky, Erwin, ed., 1946. *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St Denis and its Art Treasures* (Princeton, NJ)
- Pardo, Mary, 1993. 'Artifice as Seduction in Titian', *Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe: Institutions, Texts, Images*, ed. James G. Turner (Cambridge), 55–89
- Pascoli, Lione, 1730–6. *Vite de' pittori, scultori, ed architetti moderni*, 2 vols (Rome)
- Passeri, G. B., 1772. *Vite de' pittori, scultori ed architetti che anno lavorato in Roma* (Rome)
- , 1934. *Die Künstlerbiographien* (1772), ed. J. Hess (Leipzig and Vienna)
- Patterson, Annabel, 1987. *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry* (Oxford)
- Paul, Carole, 2008. *The Borghese Collections and the Display of Art in the Age of the Grand Tour* (Aldershot)
- Peers, E. Allison, ed., 1946. *The Complete Works of Saint Teresa of Avila*, 3 vols (London)
- , trans., 1978. *The Spiritual Canticle and Poems of St John of the Cross* (Wheathampstead)
- Pepper, D. Stephen, 1984. *Guido Reni: A Complete Catalogue of his Works* (Oxford)
- Pergola, Paolo della, 1955–9. *Galleria Borghese: I dipinti*, 2 vols (Rome)
- Perlove, Shelley Karen, 1990. *Bernini and the Idealization of Death: The Blessed Ludovica Albertoni and the Altieri Chapel* (University Park, Penn., and London)
- Perrault, Charles, 1993. *Mémoires de ma vie* (1755) (Paris)
- Perrucci, Andrea, 1699. *Dell'arte rappresentativa premeditata ed all'improvviso* (Naples)
- Pesco, Daniela del, 2007. *Bernini in Francia: Paul de Chantelou e il Journal de voyage du cavalier Bernin en France* (Naples)
- Petersen, Nils Holger, 2012. 'The Quarant' Ore: Early Modern Ritual and Performativity', *Performativity and Performance in Baroque Rome*, ed. Peter Gillgren and Marten Snickare (Farnham), 115–36
- Petrucchi, Armando, 1993. *Public Lettering: Script, Power, and Culture* (1980), trans. Linda Lappin (Chicago)
- Petrucchi, Francesco, 2004. 'Bernini pubblico e Bernini privato: La Fontana dei Fiumi e il tema cristologico', *Velázquez, Bernini, Luca Giordano: Le corti del Barocco*, ed. Fernando Checa Cremades (Milan), 67–83 [exhibition catalogue]
- Phelan, Peggy, 1993. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* (London)
- Pliny, 1962. *Natural History*, trans. D. E. Eichholz, Loeb Classical Library (London and Cambridge, Mass.)
- Plutarch, 1971. *Life of Alexander*, trans. K. J. Maidment (Auckland)
- Pollock, Griselda, 2003. 'Cockfights and Other Parades: Gesture, Difference, and the Staging of Meaning in Three Paintings by Zoffany, Pollock, and Krasner', *Oxford Art Journal*, 26, 141–66
- Pommier, Édouard, 1998. *Théories du portrait* (Paris)
- , 2003. 'Le portrait du pouvoir: De la norme à la réalité', *Les portraits du pouvoir*, ed. Olivier Bonfait, Brigitte Marin and Anne-Lise Desmas (Paris), 3–17

- , 2004. 'Théories du portrait et pratiques du portrait: L'exemple de Ferrare', *L'età di Alfonso I e la pittura del Dosso. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Ferrara, Palazzina di Marfisa d'Este, 9–12 dicembre 1998* (Modena), 201–13
- Portoghesi, Paolo, 1965. *Infanzia delle machine: Introduzione alla tecnica curiosa* (Rome)
- Posner, Donald, 1970. *Annibale Carracci: A Study in the Reform of Painting around 1590* (London)
- , 1971. 'Caravaggio's Homo-erotic Early Works', *Art Quarterly*, 34, 301–24
- Poussin, Nicolas, 1964. *Lettres et propos sur l'art*, ed. Anthony Blunt, Paris, 1964
- Povoledo, Elena, 1964. 'Palchi, palchetti', *Le lieu théâtral à la Renaissance*, ed. J. Jacquot (Paris), 95–104
- Pozzo, Andrea, 1693–1700. *Prospettiva de' pittori e architetti* (Rome)
- Preimesberger, Rudolf, 1974. 'Obeliscus Pamphilus: Beiträge zu Vorgeschichte und Ikonographie des Vierströmebrunnens auf Piazza Navona', *Münchener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 25, 77–162
- , 1985. 'Themes from Art Theory in the Early Work of Bernini', *Gianlorenzo Bernini: New Aspects of his Art and Thought*, ed. Irving Lavin (University Park, Penn., and London), 1–18
- , 1986. 'Berninis Cappella Cornaro. Eine Bild-Wort-Synthese des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts? Zu Irving Lavins Buch', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 49, 190–219
- , 1989. 'Zu Berninis Borghese-Skulpturen', *Antikenrezeption im Hochbarock*, ed. Herbert Beck and Sabine Schulze (Berlin), 118–27
- , 1998. 'David', *Bernini scultore: La nascita del barocco in Casa Borghese*, ed. Anna Coliva and Sebastian Schütze (Rome), 204–219 [exhibition catalogue]
- , 1999. 'Ephemer in dauernder Gestalt: Zu Berninis Hochaltar in Castelgandolfo', *Barocke Inszenierung*, ed. Joseph Imorde, Fritz Neumeyer and Tristan Weddingen, Emsdetten, 116–25.
- , 2000. '"Avec une honnête hardiesse": Bernini in Saint-Germain', *Jenseits der Grenzen: Französische und deutsche Kunst vom Ancien Régime bis zur Gegenwart. Thomas W. Gaehtgens zum 60. Geburtstag*, vol. 1: *Inszenierung der Dynastien*, ed. Uwe Fleckner, Martin Schieder and Michael F. Zimmermann (Cologne), 149–65
- , 2006. 'Bernini Portraits, Stolen and Nonstolen, in Chantelou's Journal and the Bernini Vite', *Bernini's Biographies: Critical Essays*, ed. Maarten Delbeke, Evonne Levy and Steven F. Ostrow (University Park, Penn.), 201–22
- , 2011a. 'Lelio Guidiccioni's Letter to Bernini: A Commentary', *Sculpture Journal*, 20, ed. Andrea Bacchi, Catherine Hess and Evonne Levy [special issue], 207–22
- , 2011b. *Paragons and Paragone: Van Eyck, Raphael, Michelangelo, Caravaggio, Bernini* (Los Angeles)
- Pressouyre, Sylvia, 1984. *Nicolas Cordier: Recherches sur la sculpture à Rome autour de 1600* (Rome)
- Previtali, Giovanni, 1962. 'Il Costantino messo alla berlina ò Bernino su la Porta di San Pietro', *Paragone: Arte*, 13, 55–8
- Prodi, Paolo, 1987. *The Papal Prince. One Body and Two Souls: The Papal Monarchy in Early Modern Europe* (1982), trans. Susan Haskins (Cambridge)
- Puppi, Lionello, 1999. *Andrea Palladio* (1973) (Milan)
- Quinterio, Francesco, 1981. 'La casa del Bernini', *Gian Lorenzo Bernini: il testamento, la casa, la raccolta dei beni*, ed. Franco Borsi (Florence), 13–38
- Quiviger, François, 1995. 'The Presence of Artists in Literary Academies', *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. D. S. Chambers and François Quiviger (London), 105–12
- Raguenet, François, 1700. *Les monumens de Rome, ou Descriptions des plus beaux ouvrages de peinture, de sculpture, et d'architecture, qui se voyent à Rome, & aux environs* (Paris)

- Rak, Michele, 1997. 'Il carnevale: Dal trionfo umanistico alla passeggiata borghese', *La festa a Roma dal Rinascimento al 1870*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo, 2 vols (Turin and Rome), 98–119 [exhibition catalogue]
- Ranum, Orest, 1993. *The Fronde: A French Revolution, 1648–52* (New York)
- Ravaglioli, Armando, 1973. *Piazza Navona, centro di Roma* (Rome)
- Reinhard, Wolfgang, 1974. *Papstfinanz und Nepotismus unter Paul V, 1605–1621*, 2 vols (Stuttgart)
- Reinhardt, Volker, 1984. *Kardinal Scipione Borghese (1605–1633): Vermögen, Finanzen und sozialer Aufstieg eines Papstnepoten* (Tübingen)
- Rendina, Claudio, 1991. *Pasquino, statua parlante: Quattro secoli di pasquinate* (Rome)
- Rice, Louise, 1997. *The Altars and Altarpieces of New St Peter's: Outfitting the Basilica* (Cambridge)
- Richards, Kenneth, and Laura Richards, 1990. *The Commedia dell'Arte: A Documentary History* (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.)
- Rinne, Katherine Wentworth, 2010. *The Waters of Rome: Aqueducts, Fountains, and the Birth of the Baroque City* (London and New Haven, Conn.)
- Rivosecchi, Valerio, 1982. *Esotismo in Roma barocca: Studi sul padre Kircher* (Rome)
- Roani Villani, Roberta, 1993. 'Precisazioni sull'Ermacrodito del Louvre e su alcune sculture appartenute al Cardinal del Monte', *Paragone*, 44, 37–51
- Robertson, Clare, 2008a. *The Invention of Annibale Carracci* (Milan)
- , 2008b. 'Patronage Rivalries: Cardinals Odoardo Farnese and Pietro Aldobrandini', *Art and Identity in Early Modern Rome*, ed. Jill Burke and Michael Bury (Bodmin)
- Robson, Julien, 2006. 'Preface', *Presence* (Louisville, Ky), 13–16 [exhibition catalogue, Speed Art Museum, Louisville]
- Rockwell, Peter, 1997. 'La tecnica scultorea di "Apollo e Dafne"', *Apollo e Dafne del Bernini nella Galleria Borghese*, ed. Kristina Herrmann Fiore (Milan), 139–47
- Romano, Pietro, 1939–42. *Strade e piazza di Roma*, 3 vols (Rome)
- , and Partini, P., 1987. *Piazza Navona nella storia e nell'arte* (n.d. [1946]), repr. (Rome)
- Romei, Danielo, and Chiara d'Afflito, eds, 2000. *I teatri del paradiso: La personalità, l'opera, il mecenatismo di Giulio Rospigliosi (Papa Clemente XI)* (Florence) [exhibition catalogue, Palazzo Comunale, Pistoia]
- Rooses, Max, 1910. 'De vreemde reizigers Rubens of zijn huis bezoekende', *Rubens-Bulletijn*, 5, 221–33
- Rose, Gillian, 1993. *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge* (Cambridge)
- Rossi, Ermete, 1928. 'Marforio in Campidoglio', *Roma*, 6, 337–46
- Rossi Pinelli, Orietta, 1986. 'Chirurgia della memoria: Scultura antica e restauri storici', *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana*, ed. Salvatore Settis (Turin), 183–253
- Rowland, Ingrid D., 2001. 'Th' United Sense of th' Universe: Athanasius Kircher in Piazza Navona', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 46, 153–81
- Rubin, Patricia, 1995. *Giorgio Vasari: Art and History* (New Haven, Conn., and London)
- Ruiz, Delfin Rodríguez, 2003. 'Sobre el modelo de bronce de la Fontana dei Quattro Fiumi de Gian Lorenzo Bernini conservada en el Palacio Real de Madrid', *Reales Sitios*, no. 155, 26–41
- Sabatier, Gérard, 2007. "Le portrait de César, c'est César": Lieux et mise en scène du portrait du roi dans la France de Louis XIV', *L'image du roi de François Ier à Louis XIV*, ed. Thomas W. Gaehtgens and Nicole Hochner, Paris, 2007, 209–244
- Sabbatini, Niccolò, 1955. *Pratica di fabricar scene e machine ne' teatri*, ed. Elena Povoledo (Rome)
- Salatino, Kevin, 1997. *Incendiary Art: The Representation of Fireworks in Early Modern Europe* (Los Angeles)

- Salerno, Luigi, Luigi Spezzaferro and Manfredo Tafuri, 1973. *Via Giulia: Una utopia urbanistica del 500* (Rome)
- Sandrart, Joachim von, 1925. *Teutsche Academie der Bau-, Bild-, und Mahlerey Künste* (1675), ed. A. R. Peltzer (Munich)
- San Juan, Rose Marie, 2001. *Rome: A City Out of Print* (Minneapolis and London)
- Santini, Bernardino, 1673. *I voli d'amore* (Bologna)
- Saviotti, Alfredo, 1903. 'Feste e spettacoli nel seicento', *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, 41, 42–77
- Schechner, Richard, 1985. *Between Theatre and Anthropology* (Philadelphia)
- , 1988. *Performance Theory* (London)
- Schiavo, Armando, 1956. 'Il viaggio del Bernini in Francia nei documenti dell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano', *Bolletino del Centro di Studi per la Storia dell'Architettura*, 10, 23–80
- Schlosser, Julius von, 2008. 'Geschichte der Porträtbildnerei in Wachs' (1911), trans. as 'History of Portraiture in Wax', *Ephemeral Bodies: Wax Sculpture and the Human Figure*, ed. Roberta Panzanelli (Los Angeles), 171–314
- Schmitt, Berthold, 1997. *Giovanni Lorenzo Bernini: Figur und Raum* (St Ingbert)
- Schnapper, Antoine, ed., 1982. *La scenografia barocca. Atti del XXIV Congresso internazionale di storia dell'arte*, 5, ed. Antoine Schnapper (Bologna)
- Schneider, Pablo, and Zitzlsperger, Philipp, eds, 2006. *Bernini in Paris: Das Tagebuch des Paul Féreart de Chantelou über den Aufenthalt Gianlorenzo Berninis am Hof Ludwigs XIV* (Berlin)
- Schroeder, H. J., trans., 1978. *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Rockford, Ill.)
- Schröder, Gerhart, 1989. 'Das freche Feuer der Moderne und das Heilige: Zu Berninis Cappella Cornaro', *Antikenrezeption im Hochbarock*, ed. Herbert Beck and Sabine Schulze (Berlin), 193–203
- Schütze, Sebastian, 1994. "Urbano inalza Pietro, e Pietro Urbano": Beobachtungen zu Idee und Gestalt der Ausstattung von Neu-St. Peter unter Urban VIII', *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 29, 213–87
- , 1997. *Kardinal Maffeo Barberini, später Papst Urban VIII, als Auftraggeber und Mäzen: Beiträge zu einer Archäologie des Römischen Hochbarock* (Berlin)
- , 1998. 'Urbano VIII', *Bernini scultore: La nascita del barocco in Casa Borghese*, ed. Anna Coliva and Sebastian Schütze (Rome), 243–51 [exhibition catalogue]
- , 1999. 'La Cathedra Petri: Superbissima macchina nella tribuna della Chiesa di San Pietro', *Bernini e la Roma di Alessandro VII*, ed. Anna Coliva and Marcello Fagiolo (Cinisello Balsamo), 191–207
- , 2008. "Werke als Kalküle ihres Wirkungsanspruchs": Die Cathedra Petri und ihr Bedeutungswandel im konfessionellen Zeitalter', *Sankt Peter in Rom, 1506–2006: Beiträge der internationalen Tagung vom 22.–25. Februar 2006 in Bonn*, ed. Georg Satzinger and Sebastian Schütze (Munich), 405–25
- , 2009. *Caravaggio: The Complete Works* (Cologne and London)
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, and Andrew Parker, eds, 1995. *Performativity and Performance* (New York and London)
- Segneri, Paolo, 1679. *Quaresimale* (Florence)
- Sestieri, Ettore, 1970. *La Fontana dei Quattro Fiumi e il suo bozzetto* (Rome)
- Settis, Salvatore, 1992. 'Introduction', in Edward Hüttinger, *Case d'artisti dal Rinascimento a oggi* (Turin)
- Shearman, John, 1980. 'Correggio's Illusionism', *La prospettiva rinascimentale: Codificazioni e trasgressioni*, ed. Marisa Dalai Emiliani (Florence), 281–84,
- , 1987. 'Raphael's Clouds, and Correggio's', *Studi su Raffaello. Atti del Congresso internazionale di studi: Urbino-Firenze, 6–14 aprile 1984*, ed. Micaela Sambucco Hamoud and Maria Letizia Strocchi (Urbino), 657–68

- Sigel, Anthony, 1999. 'The Clay Modelling Techniques of Gian Lorenzo Bernini', *Sketches in Clay for Projects by Gian Lorenzo Bernini: Theoretical, Technical, and Case Studies*, ed. Ivan Gaskell and Henry Lie (*Harvard University Art Museums Bulletin*, 6/3), 48–72
- , 2002. 'The Technical Study of a Terracotta Modello of the Moor', *Bernini: The Modello for the Fountain of the Moor*, ed. Andrew Butterfield (New York), 48–71
- Silenzi, Fernando, and Renato Silenzi, 1968. *Pasquino: Quattro secoli di satira romana* (Florence)
- Silos, Joannes Michael, 1678. *Pinacotheca sive Romana pictura et sculptura* (Rome)
- Silverio de Santa Teresa, ed., 1915–24. *Obras de Santa Teresa de Jesús*, 9 vols (Burgos)
- Simonetta, Giuseppe, Laura Gigli and Gabriella Marchetti, 2003. *Sant'Agnese in Agone in Piazza Navona: bellezza, proporzione, armonia nelle fabbriche Pamphili* (Rome)
- Skinner, Quentin, 1978. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols (Cambridge)
- Smart, Alastair, 1965. 'Dramatic Gesture and Expression in the Age of Hogarth and Reynolds', *Apollo*, 82, 90–97
- Snyder, Joel, 1985. 'Las Meninas and the Mirror of Princes', *Critical Inquiry*, 114, 539–72
- Solkin, David H., 1982. *Richard Wilson: The Landscape of Reaction* (London) [exhibition catalogue, Tate Gallery]
- Sommer, Frank H., 1970. 'The Iconography of Action: Bernini's Ludovica Albertoni', *Art Quarterly*, 33/1, 30–8
- Soussloff, Catherine, 1989. 'Imitatio Buonarroti', *Sixteenth-Century Journal*, 20, 581–602
- Sparti, Donatella, 1997. *La casa di Pietro da Cortona: Architettura, accademia, atelier e officina* (Rome)
- Spear, Richard, 1982. *Domenichino* (New Haven, Conn., and London)
- , 1985. 'The Critical Fortune of a Realist Painter', *The Age of Caravaggio* (New York), 22–7 [exhibition catalogue]
- Stani, Milovan, 2004. 'Louis XIV et Bernin: Le voyage du Bernin à la cour de France et sa place dans le décorum royal au début du règne personnel de Louis XIV', *Arte barroca e ideal clásico: Aspectos del arte cortesano ed la segunda mitad del siglo XVII* (Rome), 155–76
- Stanivukovic, Goran V., ed., 2001. *Ovid and the Renaissance Body* (Toronto)
- Stanton, Domna C., 1980. *The Aristocrat as Art: A Study of the Honnête Homme and the Dandy in Seventeenth- and Nineteenth-Century French Literature* (New York)
- Staten, Henry, 1995. *Eros in Mourning: Homer to Lacan* (Baltimore, Md)
- Stechow, Wolfgang, 1932. *Apollo und Daphne*, Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, 23 (Leipzig)
- Stewart, Susan, 1984. *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (Baltimore, Md, and London)
- Stoichita, Victor I., 1986. 'Imago regis: Kunsttheorie und königliches Porträt in den Meninas von Velázquez', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 49, 165–89
- , 1997. *The Self-Aware Image: An Insight into Early Modern Meta-Painting*, trans. Anne-Marie Glasheen (Cambridge)
- Stone, Nicholas, 1918. 'The Notebook and Account Book of Nicholas Stone', ed. W. L. Spiers, *Walpole Society Publications*, 7, 158–200
- Strinati, Claudio, and Maria Grazia Bernardini, eds, 1999. *Gian Lorenzo Bernini. Regista del Barocco: I restauri* (Rome)
- Sturm-Maddox, Sara, 1985. *Petrarch's Metamorphoses: Text and Subtext in the Rime Sparse* (Columbia Mo.)
- Summerscale, Anne, 2000. *Malvasia's 'Life of the Carracci': Commentary and Translation* (University Park, Penn.)
- Sutherland Harris, Ann, 1975. 'Angelo de' Rossi, Bernini, and the Art of Caricature', *Master Drawings*, 13, 158–60
- , 1977. *Selected Drawings of Gian Lorenzo Bernini* (New York)

- , 1987. 'La dittatura di Bernini', *Gian Lorenzo Bernini e le arti visive*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo (Rome), 43–58
- , 1990. 'Bernini's Four Rivers Fountain as Permanent Theatre', *Theatrical Spectacle and Spectacular Theatre*, ed. Barbara Wisch and Susan Scott Munshower (University Park, Penn.), 488–517
- , 1992. 'Vouet, le Bernin, et la "ressemblance parlante"', *Simon Vouet. Actes du colloque international, Galeries Nationales du Grand Palais, 5–6–7 février 1991*, ed. Stéphane Loire (Paris), 192–208
- Tafuri, Manfredo, 1976. *Teatri e scenografie* (Milan)
- , 1984. 'Roma Instaurata', *Raffaello architetto*, ed. Christoph Luitpold Frommel, Stephano Ray and Manfredo Tafuri (Milan)
- , 1992. *Ricerca del Rinascimento: Principi, città, architetti* (Turin)
- , 2006. *Interpreting the Renaissance: Princes, Cities, Architects* (1992), trans. Daniel Sherer (New Haven)
- Tagliavini, Luigi Ferdinando, 1998. 'Gli "affetti cantabili" nella musica di Girolamo Frescobaldi', *Docere, delectare, movere: Affetti, devozione e retorica nel linguaggio artistico del primo barocco romano*, ed. S. De Blaauw, P.-M. Gijssbers, S. Schütze and B. Treffers (Rome), 81–8
- Tamburini, Elena, 1997. *Due teatri per il principe: Studi sulla committenza teatrale di Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna (1659–1689), con un'ipotesi di ricostruzione del teatro 'piccolo' elaborate in collaborazione con Sergio Rotondi* (Rome)
- , 1999–2000. "Naturalezza d'artificio" nella finzione scenica berniniana: La Comica del cielo di Giulio Rospigliosi (1668)', *Rassegna di Architettura e Urbanistica*, 98–100, 93–147
- , 2001. 'Su un apparato teatrale berniniano (1668): Documenti e nuove ricognizioni', *Teatri nell'età moderna*, ed. Federico Gorio (Rome), 93–179.
- , 2003. 'Per uno studio documentario delle forme sceniche: I teatri dei Barberini e gli interventi berniniani', *Tragedie dell'Onore nell'Europa barocca. XXVI Convegno internazionale, Roma, 12–15 settembre 2002*, ed. Maria Chiabò and Federico Doglio (Rome), 255–75
- , 2005. 'Strumenti retorici e sinestesie. La messinscena berniniana della "Comica del cielo" (1668)', *Lo spettacolo del sacro, la morale del profano: Su Giulio Rospigliosi (Papa Clemente IX). Atti del Convegno internazionale, Pistoia, 23–23 settembre 2000*, ed. Danilo Romei (Florence), 97–112
- , 2009. 'Cultura materiale del teatro: Le tecniche scenografiche di Bernini e quelle dei Vigarani', *Gaspere & Carlo Vigarani: Dalla corte degli Este a quella di Luigi XIV*, ed. Walter Baricchi and Jérôme de La Gorce (Cinisello Balsamo), 96–112.
- , 2010a. 'Entre l'art et le théâtre: Antithèse et "tromperie" dans la poétique du Bernin', *Rome–Paris 1640: Transferts culturels et renaissance d'un centre artistique*, ed. Marc Bayard (Rome and Paris), 435–61.
- , 2010b. 'Sui teatri dei Barberini: Nuovi documenti e alcune riflessioni', *L'immaginario scenografico e la realizzazione musicale*, ed. Maria Ida Biggi and Paolo Gallarati (Alessandria), 33–54
- Tazi, Nadia, 1989. 'Celestial Bodies: A Few Stops on the Way to Heaven', *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, ed. Michel Feher with Ramona Noddaff and Nadia Tazi, 3 vols. (New York), vol. 2, 519–52
- Tesauro, Emanuele, 2000. *Il cannocchiale aristotelico, o sia Idea dell'arguta et ingeniosa elocutione che serve à tutta l'arte oratoria, lapidaria, et simbolica*, 5th edn (1670), facsimile (Savigliano)
- Teti, Girolamo, 1642. *Aedes Barberini* (Rome)

- Tietze, Hans, 1906–7. ‘Annibale Carraccis Galerie im Palazzo Farnese und seine römische Werkstätte’, *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 26, 49–182
- Tilly, Charles, 1986. *The Contentious French* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Tomaselli, Sylvia, and Roy Porter, eds, 1986. *Rape: An Historical and Cultural Enquiry* (Oxford)
- Torniai, Paola, 1986. ‘Il possesso pontificio nel teatro della Roma barocca: Il potere, l’immagine, la meraviglia’, *Storia dell’Arte*, 58, 229–46
- , 1991. ‘Il carnevale sacro a Roma nel seicento: Vocabolario artistico, apparato scenotecnico, corredo iconografico dell’Quarant’ore’, *Storia dell’Arte*, 71, 94–108
- Turchetti, Pietro, 1996. ‘Le nuvole’, *Critica d’Arte*, 59, 45–56
- Turner, Victor, 1986. *The Anthropology of Performance* (New York)
- Vandermoere, Joseph, 1845. *Acta S. Teresiae a Jesu, carmelitarum strictioris observantiae parentis, commentario et observationibus illustrata* (Brussels); repr. from *Acta Sanctorum*, 7 (October), 109–790
- Vertue, George, 1930. *Notebooks*, vol. 1, Walpole Society, 18 (Oxford)
- Villari, Rosario, ed., 1995. *Baroque Personae*, trans. Linda Cochrane (Chicago)
- Visceglia, Maria Antonietta, 2002a. *La città rituale* (Rome)
- . ‘Riti, simboli, cerimonie nell’Italia nella prima età moderna: Una riflessione storiografica comparativa’, *La città rituale: Roma e le sue cerimonie in età moderna* (Rome), 17–51
- , and Catherine Brice, 1997. *Cérémonial et rituel à Rome: XVI–XIX siècles*, Collection de l’École Française de Rome, 231 (Rome)
- Vischer, Robert, 1994. *Empathy, Form and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873–93* (Santa Monica, Calif.)
- Voltaire [pseud. of François-Marie Arouet], 1966. *Le siècle de Louis XIV (1751)*, 2 vols (Paris)
- Vuilleumier, Florence, 1987. ‘La rhétorique du monument: L’inscription dans l’architecture en Europe au XVIIe siècle’, *XVIIe Siècle*, 156, 291–312
- Waddy, Patricia, 1990. *Seventeenth-Century Palaces: Use and the Art of the Plan* (Cambridge, Mass., and London)
- Wandel, Lee, 2006. *The Eucharist in the Reformation* (Cambridge)
- Warburg, Aby, 1999. *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity: Contributions to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance (1932)*, introduction by Kurt W. Forster, trans. David Britt (Los Angeles)
- , 2000. *Der Bilderatlas Mnemosyne*, ed. Martin Warnke and Claudia Brink (Berlin)
- Warma, Suzanne, 1984. ‘Ecstasy and Vision: Two Concepts Connected with Bernini’s Teresa’, *Art Bulletin*, 66, 508–11
- Warnke, Martin, 1993. *The Court Artist: On the Ancestry of the Modern Artist (1985)*, trans. David McLintock (Cambridge)
- Warwick, Genevieve, 1997. ‘Gift Exchange and Art Collecting: Padre Sebastiano Resta’s Drawing Albums’, *Art Bulletin*, 79, 630–46
- , 2000. *The Arts of Collecting: Padre Sebastiano Resta and the Market for Drawings in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge)
- , 2004. ‘Speaking Statues: Bernini’s *Apollo and Daphne* at the Villa Borghese’, *Art History*, 27, 353–81
- , 2006a. ‘Allegories of Eros: Caravaggio’s *Masque*’, *Caravaggio: Realism, Rebellion, Reception*, ed. Genevieve Warwick (Newark, NJ), 82–90
- , 2006b. ‘Pasquinade at Piazza Navona: Public Art and Popular Protest’, *Ex marmore: Pasquini, pasquinisti, pasquinate nell’Europa moderna. Atti del Colloquio internazionale, Lecce–Otranto, 17–19 novembre 2005*, ed. Chrysa Damianaki, Paolo Procaccioli and Angelo Romano (Rome), 355–76

- , 2009. 'Making Statues Speak: Bernini and Pasquino' *Articulate Objects: Voice, Sculpture and Performance*, ed. Aura Satz and Jon Wood (Oxford), 29–46
- , 2010. 'Soleil et nuages: Le Bernin, artiste de cour entre Rome et Paris', *Rome–Paris 1640*, *Académie de France à Rome*, ed. Marc Bayard (Rome and Paris), 463–80
- , 2012a. 'Bernini's Louis XIV: Between Production and Display', *Studiolo*
- , 2012b. 'Ritual Form and Urban Space in Early Modern Rome', *Symbols and Rituals in Late Medieval and Early Modern Italy*, ed. Samuel Cohn, Marcello Fantoni, Franco Franceschini and Fabrizio Ricciardelli (Brepols)
- , forthcoming. 'The Story of the Man who Whitened his Face: Bernini's Art of Sculpture'
- Ważbinski, Zygmunt, 1992. 'Il cavaliere d'Arpino ed il mito accademico: il problema dell'autoidentificazione con l'ideale', *Der Künstler über sich in seinem Werk: Internationales Symposium der Bibliotheca Hertziana, Rom 1989*, ed. Matthias Winner (Weinheim)
- Webb, Michael, 1990. *The City Square* (London)
- Weil, Mark S., 1974a. 'The Devotion of the Forty Hours and the Roman Baroque Illusion', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 37, 218–49
- , 1974b. *The History and Decoration of the Ponte S. Angelo* (University Park, Penn.)
- , 1992. 'L'orazione delle Quarant'ore come guida allo sviluppo del linguaggio barocco', *Il barocco romano e l'Europa*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna, *Centri e Periferie del Barocco*, 1 (Rome), 675–694
- Weitzel Gibbons, Mary, 1995. *Giambologna: Narrator of the Catholic Reformation* (Berkeley, Calif., and London)
- Welch, Evelyn, 2004. 'Painting as Performance in the Italian Renaissance Court', *Artists at Court: Image-Making and Identity, 1300–1550*, ed. Stephen J. Campbell (Chicago), 19–32
- Werner, Michel, and Bénédicte Zimmermann, 2002. 'Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung: Der Ansatz der Histoire croisée und der Herausforderung des Transnationalen', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 28, 607–36
- Weston-Lewis, Aidan, ed., 1998. *Effigies and Ecstasies: Roman Baroque Sculpture and Design in the Age of Bernini* (Edinburgh)
- Williams, Raymond, 1973. *The Country and the City* (London)
- Winner, Matthias, 1985. 'Bernini the Sculptor and the Classical Heritage in his Early Years: Praxiteles', Bernini's and Lanfranco's Pluto and Proserpina', *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 22, 191–207
- , 1998a. 'Ermafrodito', *Bernini scultore: La nascita del barocco in Casa Borghese*, ed. Anna Coliva and Sebastian Schütze (Rome), 124–33 [exhibition catalogue]
- , 1998b. 'Paragone mit dem Belvederischen Apoll: Kleine Wirkungsgeschichte der Statue von Antioco bis Canova', *Il cortile delle statue: Der Statuenhof des Belvedere im Vatikan. Akten des Internationalen Kongresses zu Ehren von Richard Krautheimer, Rom 21–23 Oktober 1992*, ed. Matthias Winner, Bernard Andreae and Carlo Pietrangeli (Mainz), 227–52
- , 1998c. 'Ratto di Proserpina', *Bernini scultore: La nascita del barocco in Casa Borghese*, ed. Anna Coliva and Sebastian Schütze (Rome), 180–203 [exhibition catalogue]
- Wittkower, Rudolf, 1934. 'Le Bernin et le Baroque romain', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 11, 327–41
- , 1951. *Bernini's Bust of Louis XIV*, *Charlton Lectures on Art*, 33 (Oxford)
- , 1961. 'The Vicissitudes of a Dynastic Monument: Bernini's Equestrian Statue of Louis XIV', *Essays in Honor of Erwin Panofsky*, ed. Millard Meiss, 2 vols, *De Artibus Opuscula*, 40, (New York), 497–531
- , 1977. *Sculpture: Processes and Principles* (New York)
- , 1997. *Bernini: The Sculptor of the Roman Baroque* (1955), 4th edn (London)

- , 1999. *Art and Architecture in Italy, 1600–1750* (1958), 6th edn, rev. Joseph Connors and Jennifer Montagu (New Haven, Conn., London)
- Wolfthal, Diane, 1999. *Images of Rape: The 'Heroic' Tradition and its Alternatives* (New York and Cambridge)
- Wood, Christopher S., 2005. 'Indoor–Outdoor: The Studio around 1500', *Inventions of the Studio: Renaissance to Romanticism*, ed. Michael Cole and Mary Pardo (Chapel Hill, SC, and London), 36–72
- Woods-Marsden, Joanna, 1998. *Renaissance Self-Portraiture: The Visual Construction of Identity and the Social Status of the Artist* (New Haven, Conn., and London)
- Yates, Frances, 1956. 'Discussion', *Les fêtes de la Renaissance*, ed. Jean Jacquot, 3 vols, (Paris), vol. 1, 422
- , 1972. *The Art of Memory* (London)
- , 1983. 'The Italian Academies', *Renaissance and Reform: the Italian Contribution* (London), 6–29
- Yepes, Diego de, 1606. *Vida, virtudes y milagros de la bien aventurada virgen Teresa de Jesús*, (Saragossa)
- Zamboni, Silla, 1968. 'Gian Lorenzo Bernini: Un modello per la 'Fontana dei Quattro Fiumi' ritorvato', *Da Bernini a Pinelli*, ed. Silla Zamboni (Bologna), 11–25
- Zerner, Henri, 1993. 'L'effet de ressemblance', *Il ritratto e la memoria*, ed. A. Gentili, P. Morel and C. Cieri Via, vol. 3 (Rome), 111–22
- Zitzlsperger, Philipp, 2002. *Gianlorenzo Bernini: Die Papst- und Herrscherporträts, zum Verhältnis von Bildnis und Macht* (Munich)
- , 2006. 'Kontroversum um Berninis Königsbuste', *Bernini in Paris: Das Tagebuch des Paul Fréart de Chantelou über den Aufenthalt Gianlorenzo Berninis am Hof Ludwigs XIV*, ed. Pablo Schneider and Philipp Zitzlsperger (Berlin), 397–414
- Zorzi, Ludovico, 1977. *Il teatro e la città* (Turin)
- , 1980. 'Il teatro e il principe', *Idee, Istituzioni, Scienza ed Arti nella Firenze dei Medici*, ed. Cesare Vasoli (Florence), 141–71
- , 1985. 'La crisi del melodrama alla fine dell'età barocca', *Barocco romano e barocco italiano: Il teatro, l'effimero, l'allegoria*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna (Rome), 3–12
- Zuccari, Alessandro, 1984. *Arte e committenza nella Roma di Caravaggio* (Rome)
- Zucker, Paul, 1959. *Town and Square: From the Agora to the Village Green* (New York)

Illustrations

- 1 Bernini, Cornaro chapel, 1647–52, detail of the entrance arch and vault (painted by Guido Ubaldo Abbadini), Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 2 Bernini, Cornaro chapel, 1647–52, detail of the entrance arch (painted by Guido Ubaldo Abbadini), Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 3 Bernini, preparatory drawing for the Cornaro chapel vault, c.1650, pen, red chalk and brown ink, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid. [CREDIT].
- 4 Bernini, *Monsignor Pedro de Foix de Montoya*, c.1621, life-size marble bust, Refectory, Santa Maria di Monserrato, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 5 Bernini, *Apollo and Daphne*, 1622–5, Carrara marble, detail of leaves, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 6 Bernini, *The Ecstasy of St Teresa*, 1647–52, marble, detail, cloud, Cornaro chapel, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. [CREDIT].
- 7 Bernini, *Truth Unveiled by Time*, c.1646–52, marble, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 8 Circle of Bernini, *Sunrise or Sunset*, before 1638, pen and ink with wash, Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin. Bildarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz (bpk) / Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, SMB/Volker-H. Schneider.
- 9 Stefano della Bella, stage design for Jean Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin, *Mirame*, Act III, from *Six planches sur la première desquelles on lit: Ouverture du théâtre de la grande salle du palais Cardinal*, 1641, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale de France.
- 10 Niccolò Sabbatini, diagram of a cloud machine, from *Pratica di fabricar scene e machine ne' teatri* (Ravenna, 1638; ed. Elena Povoledo, 1955), engraving. [CREDIT].
- 11 Diagram of triangular stage wings (*periaktoi*), from Ignazio Danti's edition of Giacomo da Vignola's *Le due regole della prospettiva pratica* (Rome, 1583), p. 91, print. Bibliotheca Hertziana – Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Rome.
- 12 Giovan Battista Doni, manuscript with sketch of a stage set for Bernini's comedy *The Two Academies*, 1635, pen and ink, Biblioteca Marucelliana, Florence, MS A CCXCV, fol. 331r. Biblioteca Marucelliana, Florence.
- 13 Domenichino, *Flagellation of St Andrew*, 1609, fresco, Oratory of St Andrew, San Gregorio Magno, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 14 Bernini, *Habakkuk with the Angel*, 1661, marble, Chigi chapel, Santa Maria del Popolo, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 15 Correggio, *The Assumption of the Virgin*, 1526–30, dome fresco, Parma Cathedral. © Photo SCALA Florence.

16 G. F. Grimaldi, *Quarant'ore teatro*, after Niccolò Menghini's design for the church of the Gesù, Rome, Carnival, 1640, engraving, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City. © 2012 Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana by permission of Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, with all rights reserved.

17 Pietro da Cortona, design for a *Quarant'ore* display in San Lorenzo in Damaso, Rome, 1633, pen and ink with wash over black chalk, Royal Collection, Windsor Castle. Supplied by Royal Collection Trust / © HM Queen Elizabeth II 2012.

18 Andrea Pozzo, *Allegory of the Missionary Work of the Jesuits*, 1691–4, ceiling fresco in the nave of San Ignazio, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence / Fondo Edifici di Culto – Ministero dell'Interno.

19 Domenico Castello, chapel of the *Cathedra Petri*, St Peter's, Rome, c.1644, [MEDIUM], Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City, Cod. Barb. Lat. 4409, fol. 18. © 2012 Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana by permission of Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, with all rights reserved.

20 Bernini, *Cathedra Petri*, 1657–66, detail of the upper half, or glory, stucco and some bronze figures, all gilt, St Peter's, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.

21 Bernini, *Baldachin*, 1624–33, bronze with gilt, showing the view to the *Cathedra Petri* in the apse, St Peter's, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.

22 Bernini, Cornaro chapel, 1647–52, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.

23 Bernini, relief of the Last Supper, gilt bronze, detail, Cornaro chapel, 1647–52, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.

24 Bernini, pavement intarsia, marble, detail, Cornaro chapel, 1647–52, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.

25 Bernini, view showing the vault, gilt stucco reliefs and stained glass window above the Cornaro chapel, 1647–52, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.

26 Bernini, lateral walls showing members of the Cornaro family, Cornaro chapel, 1647–52, marble, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.

27 Matthäus Greuter, *Canonisation of Five Saints* (Teresa of Avila, Filippo Neri, Isidore, Ignatius, Francis Xavier), after the standard, with decoration by Paolo Guidotti, for the canonisation ceremony in St Peter's, Rome, 1622, engraving, Archivio della Congregazione dell'Oratorio, Rome, CIS, XXXVI, 4. Archivio della Congregazione dell'Oratorio di Roma, Roma – Archivio Fotografico ACOR – Francesco Cantone.

28 Matthäus Greuter, *Canonisation of Five Saints*, after the canonisation standard, 1622, engraving, detail showing the transverberation of St Teresa, Archivio della Congregazione dell'Oratorio, Rome, CIS, XXXVI, 4. Archivio della Congregazione dell'Oratorio di Roma, Roma – Archivio Fotografico ACOR – Francesco Cantone

29 Adriaen Collaert and Cornelis Galle, *Transverberation of St Teresa*, from their *Vita B. Virginis Teresiae a Iesu* (Antwerp, 1613; new edn, 1630), pl. 8, engraving. Roma Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica (per gentile concessione del Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali).

- 30 Adriaen Collaert and Cornelis Galle, *Betrothal of St Teresa to Christ, Receiving the Wound of Christ's Nail*, from their *Vita B. Virginis Teresiae a Iesu* (Antwerp, 1613; new edn, 1630), pl. 13, engraving. Roma Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica (per gentile concessione del Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali).
- 31 Karel de Mallery, *Transverberation of St Teresa*, c. 1609, engraving, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Brussels. Copyright Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique.
- 32 Jacob Honervogt, *Transverberation ... of St Teresa*, frontispiece to Alessio M. della Passione, *Compendio della vita della serafica vergine S. Teresa di Giesu* (Rome, 1647), engraving. [CREDIT].
- 33 Adriaen Collaert and Cornelis Galle, *Levitation of St Teresa*, from their *Vita B. Virginis Teresiae a Iesu* (Antwerp, 1613; new edn, 1630), pl. 17, engraving. Roma Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica (per gentile concessione del Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali).
- 34 Bernini, *The Ecstasy of St Teresa*, 1647–52, marble, Cornaro chapel, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 35 Caravaggio, *The Ecstasy of St Francis*, c. 1595, oil on canvas, Ella Gallup Sumner and Mary Catlin Sumner Collection Fund, Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Connecticut. 2012 Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art / Art Resource, NY / Scala, Florence.
- 36 Boetius à Bolswert, emblem *Fulcite me floribus, stipate me malis*, from Herman Hugo, *Pia desideria* (Antwerp, 1624; new edn, Graz, 1651), bk III, p. 298, pl. 32, engraving. Bibliotheca Hertziana – Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Rome.
- 37 Stage set for Stefano Landi's *Il Sant'Alessio* (libretto by Giulio Rospigliosi), Rome, 1634, engraving. Special Collections, R.X.II, p. 8, Glasgow University Library.
- 38 Giuliano Finelli(?), escutcheon for the pedestal of Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne*, c. 1625, marble, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 39 Flaminio Ponzio and Giovanni Vasanzio, Villa Borghese, Rome, c. 1608–17, south façade. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 40 *Apollo Belvedere*, second century, marble, Roman copy of a Greek bronze original, Museo Pio-Clementino, Vatican Museums, Vatican City. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 41 Johann Wilhelm Baur, *Villa Borghese*, c. 1636, watercolour on parchment, Galleria Borghese, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 42 Caravaggio, *Boy Bitten by a Lizard*, 1595–1600, oil on canvas, National Gallery, London. © 2012. Copyright The National Gallery, London / Scala Florence.
- 43 Annibale Carracci, *The Loves of the Gods*, 1597–1600, ceiling fresco, Galleria Farnese, Palazzo Farnese, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.

- 44 *Hermaphrodite*, Hellenistic period, restored 1619–20, marble, Musée du Louvre, Paris (formerly Galleria Borghese, Rome). © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 45 Giovanni Francesco Susini, *Hermaphrodite*, 1639, bronze, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 46 Bernini, *Pluto and Proserpina*, 1621–2, marble, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 47 Bernini, *Pluto and Proserpina*, 1621–2, marble, detail of Proserpina's face, Galleria Borghese, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 48 Giovanni Lanfranco, *The Gods of Olympus*, 1624–5, ceiling fresco, loggia (Sala 14), Villa Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 49 Girolamo Rainaldi, *teatrino*, 1613–16, Parco dei Daini, Villa Borghese, Rome, photograph. Photo: Helen Boessenecker.
- 50 Bernini, *Apollo and Daphne*, 1622–5, Carrara marble, detail of Daphne's stomach, Galleria Borghese, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 51 Bernini, *Pluto and Proserpina*, 1621–2, marble, detail of Proserpina's thigh, Galleria Borghese, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 52 Pietro da Cortona, *The Triumph of Divine Providence*, 1633–9, ceiling fresco, Palazzo Barberini, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 53 Pierre-Adrien Pâris, *Plan of the Casino of the Villa Borghese with the Stanza di Dafne (IV)*, [DATE], pen and ink with wash, Bibliothèque Municipale, Besançon (vol. 479, no. 81). Bibliothèque Municipale de Besançon.
- 54 Bernini, *Apollo and Daphne*, 1622–5, Carrara marble, sequentialised views, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 55 Hans Jakob I. Bachmann, *Diana and the Centaur*, automaton and clock, Augsburg, 1602–6, Kunstkammer, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. [CREDIT].
- 56 Caravaggio, *The Lute Player*, c. 1596, oil on canvas, Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg. © Photo SCALA Florence
- 57 Hans Schlottheim and Silvester II Eberlin, *The Triumph of Bacchus*, Augsburg, 1602–6, musical automaton, Kunstkammer, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. [CREDIT].
- 58 Bernini, *Pluto and Proserpina*, 1621–2, marble, detail, head of Proserpina, Galleria Borghese, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 59 Bernini, *Apollo and Daphne*, 1622–5, Carrara marble, detail, head of *Daphne*, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.

- 60 *Laocoön*, first century, marble, Roman copy of a Greek bronze original, detail of the face, Museo Pio-Clementino, Vatican Museums, Vatican City. © Photo SCALA Florence
- 61 *Niobe and her Children*, third–second century bc, marble, probably Roman copies of Greek originals, Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence. Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Firenze.
- 62 Bernini, *Anima dannata*, c.1619, marble, Palazzo di Spagna, Rome. Bildarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz (bpk) / Joseph Martin.
- 63 Bernini, Giocondi-Forti model for the *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, c.1648, wood, slate and terracotta, private collection, Rome. Araldo de Luca / www.araldodeluca.com.
- 64 Bernini, *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, 1648–51, travertine and marble, Piazza Navona, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 65 Bernini, preparatory model for the *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, c.1649, terracotta and wood, Accademia di Belle Arti, Bologna. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico di Bologna, all rights reserved.
- 66 Bernini, lion, preparatory model for the *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, c.1648–9, terracotta, Accademia Nazionale di San Luca, Rome. Accademia Nazionale di San Luca.
- 67 Anon., miniature model of the *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, after 1651, gilt bronze, Palacio Real, Madrid. Copyright © Patrimonio Nacional, Palacio Real, Madrid.
- 68 Frontispiece, Athanasius Kircher, *Obeliscus Pamphilius: hoc est, interpretatio nova & hucusque intentata obelisci hieroglyphici* (Rome, 1650), engraving. Bibliotheca Hertziana – Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Rome.
- 69 Francesco Borromini, drawing for a fountain of four rivers...© 2012 Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana by permission of Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, with all rights reserved.
- 70 Pompilio Totti, view of Piazza Navona, from his *Ritratto di Roma moderna* (Rome, 1638), p. 232, engraving. Bibliotheca Hertziana – Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Rome.
- 71 Johann Wilhelm Baur (attrib.), *Piazza Navona*, 1625–34, oil on canvas, Museo di Roma, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 72 Anon., firework display in Piazza Spagna, celebrating Rome Triumphant over the four continents, 1644, from Laurentius Banck's pamphlet, *Roma Triumphans* (Rome, 1645; new edn, 1656), engraving. Bibliotheca Hertziana – Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Rome.
- 73 Anon., firework display in Piazza Navona, re-creating Mount Ararat, 1644, from Laurentius Banck's pamphlet, *Roma Triumphans* (Rome, 1645; new edn, 1656), engraving. Bibliotheca Hertziana – Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte Rome.
- 74 Bernini, *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, 1648–51, travertine and marble, Piazza Navona, Rome, detail of the base. © Photo SCALA Florence

- 75 Filippo Gagliardi, Andrea Sacchi, Maciola, *Saracens' Joust at Piazza Navona, February 25 1634*, c.1625–50, oil on canvas, Museo di Roma, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 76 Dominique Barrière, *Piazza Navona, 1650*, engraving, Museo di Roma, Rome, illustrating the *apparato* for the festival of the Resurrection by Carlo Rainaldi, G. P. Schor and G. B. Passeri. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 77 Bernini, *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, 1648–51, travertine and marble, Piazza Navona, Rome, detail showing Rio della Plata. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 78 Bernini, *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, 1648–51, travertine and marble, Piazza Navona, Rome, detail showing Danube. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 79 Charles Le Brun, *L'étonnement* from *L'expression des passions* (Paris, 1698), engraving, Fonds des Dessins et Miniatures, Département des Arts Graphiques, Musée du Louvre, Paris. RMN / Paris, Musée du Louvre, D.A.G. / Martine Beck-Coppola.
- 80 Bernini, *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, 1648–51, travertine and marble, Piazza Navona, Rome, detail showing Ganges. Photo Scala.
- 81 Alessandro Specchi, *Raising of the Vatican Obelisk, 1596*, from Carlo Fontana, *Templum Vaticanum et ipsius origo: cum aedificiis maxime conspicuis antiquitus, & recens ibidem constitutis* (Rome, 1694), bk III, p. 196, engraving. Bibliotheca Hertziana – Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Rome.
- 82 Pierre Paul Sevin, *Festival Float with Clouds*, 1668, pen and wash, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm. [CREDIT].
- 83 Filippo Gagliardi (attrib.), *Innocent X Visiting the Fountain of the Four Rivers*, 1651, oil on canvas, Museo di Roma, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 84 Aerial view of Piazza Navona, Archivi Alinari. [CREDIT].
- 85 View of Piazza Navona from Palazzo Pamphili, Rome. [CREDIT].
- 86 Lieven Cruyl, *Allagamento at Piazza Navona*, c.1670, pen, brown ink and watercolour on parchment, Gabinetto Comunale delle Stampe, Museo di Roma, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 87 *Pasquino*, Roman sculpture, first century, marble, Palazzo Braschi, Rome. Archivi Alinari.
- 88 Antoine Lafréry, *Pasquino*, from his *Speculum Romanae magnificentiae* (Rome, c.1550), engraving. Bibliotheca Hertziana – Max-Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Rome.
- 89 Bernini, *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, 1648–51, travertine and marble, Piazza Navona, Rome, detail showing Nile. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 90 Andrea Baratta, *St Eugenia*, c.1669, figure on the façade of Sant'Agnese in Agone, Piazza Navona, Rome. Photo by the author

- 91 Bernini, *Scipione Borghese* (first version), 1632, Carrara marble, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 92 Bernini, *Scipione Borghese* (second version), 1632, Carrara marble, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Museo di Roma, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 93 Bernini, *Louis XIV*, 1665, marble, Musée National du Château de Versailles. Réunion des Musées Nationaux.
- 94 Bernini, *Caricature of Scipione Borghese*, before 1633, pen and ink, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City, MS Chigi P. VI. 4, fol. 15. © 2012 Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana by permission of Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, with all rights reserved.
- 95 Bernini, *Scipione Borghese* (first version), 1632, Carrara marble, detail of the eyes, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 96 Bernini, *Louis XIV*, 1665, marble, detail of the eyes, Musée National du Château de Versailles, Versailles. Réunion des Musées Nationaux.
- 97 Bernini, *The Martyrdom of St Lawrence*, c.1617, marble, Contini-Bonacossi Collection, Florence. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 98 Bernini, *David*, 1623-4, marble, detail of David's face, Galleria Borghese, Rome. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 99 Bernini, *Portrait of Scipione Borghese*, c.1632, red chalk over graphite on paper, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York. © Photo SCALA Florence.
- 100 Bernini, *Truth Unveiled by Time*, c.1646-52, marble, detail of chalk marks on the back of the sculpture, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 101 Bernini, *Apollo and Daphne*, 1622-5, Carrara marble, detail of a chalk mark on the finger nail of *Daphne*, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Archivio Fotografico della Soprintendenza Speciale per il Patrimonio Storico, Artistico ed Etnoantropologico e per il Polo Museale della Città di Roma.
- 102 Bernini, *Apollo and Daphne*, 1622-5, Carrara marble, detail of [WHOSE] eyes, Galleria Borghese, Rome. [CREDIT].
- 103 Bernini, *David*, 1623-4, white marble, detail of the eyes, Galleria Borghese, Rome. [CREDIT].
- 104 Bernini, *Pluto and Proserpina*, 1621-2, white marble, detail of [WHOSE] eyes, Galleria Borghese, Rome. [CREDIT].

Notes

Introduction

1 First recorded in the biography of Teresa by Diego de Yepes, 1606, book 1, chapter 19; and in the tribunal investigating Teresa's canonisation recorded in Silverio de Santa Teresa, 1915–24, vol. 2, 341, as noted by Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 139, in his fundamental study of the Cornaro chapel. See also Preimesberger, 1986, followed by Lehmann, 2010, who discuss the banderole's function as an *impresa* or emblem for the chapel. On the Cornaro chapel see further Warma, 1984; Kross, 1985; Schröder, 1989; Napoleone, 1996 and 1998; Amidei, 1999; Montanari, 2003b; Barcham, 2001, on details of its patronage; and Ackermann, 2007, 43–54.

2 'Absorption' is Fried's critical term, for which see especially 1980 and 1988. Fried uses the term 'theatrical' as foil to his definition of 'absorption', on which see Stoichita's 1997 discussion of the 'self-aware' image. See also Bal, 2003.

3 See Villari, ed., 1995; and Hills, ed., 2011, for a normative use of the maligned term 'Baroque'. On Bernini's illusionism, and specifically at the Cornaro chapel, see Blunt, 1978; and H. Bauer, 1989. For analysis of *mise-en-abyme* see the fundamental study by Dällenbach, 1977, drawing on the writings of André Gide. In its application to Baroque art see especially Marin's account of the Escalier des Ambassadeurs at Versailles, 2001b; and from the extensive analyses of Velázquez's *Las meninas*, Foucault, 1966; and Snyder, 1985.

4 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 667. Unless otherwise stated, all translations from French and Italian sources are my own.

5 This is elaborated in the major sources on Bernini: Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 579–760, and Baldinucci's abridged version in vol. 4, 279–300; the biography by Bernini's son, Domenico Bernini, 1999 (1713); and Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001. See also the rich documentary citations throughout Frascchetti, 1900. On the genesis and structure of Bernini's biographies see Delbeke, Levy and Ostrow, eds, 2006, especially Montanari's argument that the artist himself orchestrated his own biographical and critical fortunes, 73–110, and Ostrow's overview, 111–42. On Domenico Bernini's biography of his father see Mormando's recent translation and edition, 2011b. For a bibliographical survey of Bernini scholarship see Montanari, 2005b.

6 We have one undated manuscript of a play by Bernini, which was discovered and published by D'Onofrio in 1963, and subsequently titled *The Impresario* by Lavin in Beecher and Ciavolella, 1985, 63, 76 n. 3. There are also descriptions of his productions in letters and diaries; some drawings of stage sets from his circle; prints after stage sets for productions he orchestrated; and account books itemising expenses for identifiable scenographic features. See especially Frascchetti, 1900; D'Onofrio, 1963; Montanari, 2004b; and Tamburini, especially 1999–2000, 2003, 2005, 2009, and 2010a. For the field more broadly see Norman's 2001 discussion of 'theatrical Baroque'.

7 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 667.

8 For a broader discussion of early modern exchanges between art and theatre, focused on painting, see Hénin, 2003. See also Eck and Bussels, eds, 2010. On Bernini and theatre, with a focus on the performing body following Alpers's work on Rembrandt, 1988, see Montanari, 2004b.

9 Lavin, 1980. Relations between media formed a cornerstone of Bernini studies across the twentieth century, particularly in consideration of the pictorial effects he achieved in sculpture, for which see Hibbard, 1965; Preimesberger, 1985 and 2011; and Ostrow, 2007.

10 Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 147. Lavin, 1989, also brings to bear the history of Baroque theatre in a further examination of Bernini's sculpture.

11 Wittkower, 1997 (1955), 158–60.

12 For example, Fry, 1926, 117. See also Spear, 1985.

13 With notable exceptions – for example, Bal, 2003.

14 Sutherland Harris, 1987; and Bernardini and Fagiolo dell'Arco, eds, 1999.

15 Frascchetti's 1900 monograph on Bernini, rich in documentary citations, includes chapters on his work in theatre as well as in the ephemeral arts that attended church ritual and court entertainments. D'Onofrio's 1963 compendium of textual sources pertaining to Bernini's work in theatre, including the discovery of one of the artist's play manuscripts, remains the key collection for this material, yet does not analyse its relation to Bernini's art. See also Fagiolo dell'Arco and Fagiolo, 1967; Beecher and Ciavolella, 1985; and Hammond, 1985. Recent articles by Montanari, 2003a, 2004b and 2007b, have uncovered new sources on Bernini's work in theatre since D'Onofrio's publication, and have reintegrated documentary evidence of his acting skill into studies of his artistic practice, with particular attention to his paintings. Equally, recent work by scholars of early modern theatre has emphasised Bernini's central position within scenographic developments in Rome under the aegis of Barberini patronage as early as the late 1620s and through the 1630s, although this has not yet been brought to bear by art historians on an analysis of his art. See Tamburini, 1997, 1999–2000, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2009, 2010a, and 2010b; Romei and d'Afflitto, eds, 2000; and S. Bruno, 2005, for recent discussion of Bernini's stage sets and the suggestion that Bernini was, as the seventeenth-century biographers had stated, involved with sets for Barberini productions at their palace.

16 In a review article Lavin acknowledged this also, writing: 'it might be said that our conception of the whole period, as well as of the artist himself, has been colored by Bernini's activity in the theatre', 1964, 568.

17 For a general overview see Alonge and Bonino, 2000.

18 See especially Schnapper, ed., 1982; Fagiolo and Madonna, eds, 1985.

19 My thanks to Mateusz Borowski, Josette Féral, Erika Fischer-Lichte and W. B. Worthen for guiding me through the literature on drama, performance and 'theatricality'. See the fundamental writings of Artaud, particularly 1964; and Brecht, especially 1996 (1951). On the question of theatricality see Barthes's definition of theatricality as 'le théâtre moins le texte' in 1964, 41–2. See further Féral, 1982 and 2002; Phelan, 1993; Fischer-Lichte, 1995, and 2001; Auslander, 1999; and Heathfield, 2004. See also the anthropological literature on performance, Schechner, 1985; and Turner, 1986; Geertz's use of the term 'theatre' in an anthropology of politics, 1980; and Goffman's analysis of everyday speech as performance, 1981.

20 Krautheimer, 1985; and Anselmi, 2005.

21 Geertz, 1980.

22 See especially Montagu, 1989.

23 Warburg, 1999 (1932), especially the chapters on theatrical costumes for the 1589 *intermedi*, 185–222, and Florentine portraiture, 349–401; Didi-Huberman, 2002a and 2002b; and Careri, 2003.

24 Werner and Zimmermann, 2002.

25 Lavin's studies of the *Baldachin* and the crossing of St Peter's, 1968a; 2007–, vol. 1, 62–183, 480–95; and 2008 underscored their concretisation of ephemeral ritual ornament and liturgical decorative art into permanent form. In the *Baldachin* Bernini rendered in bronze the temporary fabric canopies that were displayed over the tomb of St Peter on religious festivals of the church calendar, while constituting the sculptural piers of the crossing as monumental reliquaries. More recently, Dombrowski's monograph on Bernini's work at St Peter's, 2003a, has understood its orchestration in terms of religious procession; and Ackermann, 2007, following Preimesberger, 1999, has analysed Bernini's altar ensembles more broadly as 'events', emphasising their processual status. On the *Baldachin* and St Peter's see

also Kirwin, 1997. On Bernini's involvement with *Quarant'ore* decorations in 1619 see Noehles, 1969; for sculptures for the catafalque of Paul V see Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a (1977), 235–40, and 1997b. Perlove, 1990, and Careri, 1995, analyse Bernini's chapel decoration situating the gestural language of their sculptures within seventeenth-century devotional tracts and practices. Montagu, 1989, on decorative arts, too, has brought attention to liturgical objects and their ritual functions.

26 Montanari, 2004b.

27 See the discussion of the relationship between Bernini's figures, and space, by Schmitt, 1997, which also points to Bernini's work in theatre.

28 Marino, 1608, p. xxxiii. On the early modern as the 'age of the marvellous' see especially Kenseth, 1991; and Greenblatt, 1991. See also the related literature on wonder in court culture, Bynum, 1997; and Daston and Park, 1998.

29 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 669. On the early modern definition of painting as a mirror centred around Leonardo see Arasse, 1984.

30 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 589. Domenico Bernini also relates the anecdote, 1999 (1713), 16; and the story also recurs in Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001, 123. See the recent literature on Bernini's portrait busts: Bacchi, Hess and Montagu, eds, 2008; Bacchi, Montanari, Strozzi and Zikos, 2009; and Bacchi, Hess, and Levy, 2011.

31 On this anecdote see Hénin, 2010. Interestingly, the famed competition between Parrhasius and Zeuxis took place over a theatre curtain. Zeuxis painted grapes so well that birds flew onto the stage. Parrhasius in turn painted a curtain. Zeuxis asked that the curtain be lifted to view Parrhasius's competing illusion. Realising his error, Zeuxis conceded victory to his rival: although he had tricked birds, Parrhasius had deceived him, an artist.

32 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 36.

33 Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001, 46; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 15.

34 Giovan Battista Doni, quoted in Montanari, 2004b, 303.

35 See Didi-Huberman, 1994 and 2008.

36 The notion of embodied response owes much to the phenomenology of Merleau-Ponty, 1962. See also Vischer, 1994. With reference to early modern art see Lehmann and Roodenburg, 2008. For a discussion of specular bodily response in ritual see Kertzer, 1988; and Careri, 2003.

37 Gombrich, 1966; De Blaauw, Gijsbers, Schütze and Treffers, eds, 1998; Careri, 2002, 2003.

38 Frascchetti's 1900 monograph on Bernini remains an inestimable source. See also Ferrari, 2004; and Montanari, 1998b.

39 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 621. The passage is translated in Baldinucci, trans. Enggass, 1966, 40.

40 Baldinucci, 1681, 181.

41 Letter to Bernini from Lelio Guidiccioni, 4 June 1633, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. Lat. 2958, fols 202–207v, partially published in D'Onofrio, 1967, 380–8; Schütze, 1998, 245–51; and Zitzlsperger, 2002, 179–83. See also Preimesberger's discussion of the letter, 2011a.

42 On Wittkower's phrase, 'speaking likeness' see his essay of 1951, recently taken up by Hess, 2009. On the representation of the open mouth see Fumaroli, 1988; and Sutherland Harris, 1992.

43 Letter from Lelio Guidiccioni, 4 June 1633, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. Lat. 2958, fols 202–207v, on which see note 41 above. On Bernini's working practices see especially Gaskell and Lie, eds, 1999; Strinati and Bernardini, eds, 1999; and Coliva, ed., 2002.

44 Noted in Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 129.

45 On Bernini and the *paragone* see especially Preimesberger, 1985, and 2011b; and Ostrow, 2007.

46 The interest in Bernini's manipulation of his medium by technical means has produced a wealth of recent publications concerned with restoration work undertaken for the reopening of the Galleria Borghese: Herrmann Fiore, ed., 1997b; Strinati and Bernardini, eds, 1999; and Coliva, ed., 2002.

47 Warwick, 2010.

48 Lefebvre, 1974. See also Warwick, 2012b.

49 On Bernini and theatre see Frascchetti, 1900, 259–72; D'Onofrio, ed., 1963; Fagiolo dell'Arco and Fagiolo, 1967, 177–96 and related catalogue entries; Beecher and Ciavolella, 1985; and more recently Tamburini, 1999–2000, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2009, 2010a, and 2010b; Romei and d'Afflitto, eds, 2000; Montanari, 2003a, 2004b and 2007b, 36–51; and Lavin, 2007–, vol. 1, 15–31.

50 The phrase is Preimesberger's, 1999.

51 The term is Austin's, 1962, on which see especially Sedgwick and Parker, 1995; Butler, 1997; and Culler, 2000. See also Gell's 1998 discussion of agency which delivers a similar analytical framework. See also Gillgren and Snickare, eds, 2012, for its applications to Baroque art and culture. On early modern cultures of marvel and wonder see especially Greenblatt, 1991; and Kenseth, ed., 1991.

1 *Palace Scenographies*

1 On this episode see McPhee, 2002.

2 Chantelou, 23 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 136; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 142–3, and notes 166–8. Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 621; and Bernini, 1999 (1713), 80–2, also recount the reasons for the fabrication of the piece. See also Frascchetti, 1900, 171–6.

3 Bjurström, 1966.

4 Montagu, 1996.

5 The classic text is Warnke, 1993.

6 Bauer, 1982.

7 See especially Fagiolo, ed., 1997; and Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997b.

8 Lavin, 1980.

9 One undated play manuscript by Bernini remains. This was discovered by D'Onofrio and first published by him in 1963; it was subsequently republished with the title *The Impresario*, edited by Lavin, in Beecher and Ciavolella, 1985, 63–114 (on the title see 76 n. 3). There are also descriptions of Bernini's theatre productions in diaries and the avvisi; some drawings of stage sets from his circle; prints after stage sets for productions he orchestrated; and account books itemising expenses for identifiable scenographic features. See especially Frascchetti, 1900; D'Onofrio, 1963; Montanari, 2004b; and Tamburini, 1999–2000, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2009, and 2010a.

10 Passeri, 1934 (1772), 236; Tamburini, 1999–2000; Montanari, 2003a.

11 Scholars have questioned many of the older attributions of theatrical productions to Bernini, especially those for plays put on by the Barberini in their new palace, which was the centre of theatrical developments in Rome in the 1630s. However, recent documentary research in theatre history has confirmed the old attributions and sees Bernini as centrally involved in Barberini productions of the period. See especially Tamburini, 1999–2000, 2003, 2005, and 2010a.

12 Evelyn, 1959 (1641–1706), vol. 2, 261.

13 For a recent discussion of these temporary court theatres see Hermans, 2010.

14 On metatheatre see Abel, 1963; and for recent bibliography, Fischer and Greiner, 2007. Stephen Orgel's work on the Stuart court masque in Orgel and Strong, 1973, is fundamental to my analysis. See also Warwick, 2010, for a lengthier discussion.

15 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 669.

- 16 14 February 1635, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. Lat. 8033, fol. 285r–v, quoted in Bruno, 2005, 68.
- 17 Hammond, 1985; Tamburini, 2003, and 2010a; and S. Bruno, 2005.
- 18 Teti, 1642, 35.
- 19 Brauer and Wittkower, 1931, vol. 1, 33–4, fig. 15.
- 20 Elpidio Benedetti, 7 March 1640, Paris, Archives des Affaires Etrangères, Correspondance politique, Rome, 69, fols 243r–244v, quoted in Le Pas de Sécheval, 1995, 136, centred around a discussion of Niccolò Menghini as the agent of transmission. Benedetti describes the use of the sun machine in *Quarant'ore* decorations at the Gesù for that year's Carnival. See Weil, 1974a; and Noehles, 1985b, on Menghini's role in the 1640 *Quarant'ore* decorations, which shows the proximity of devotional and courtly scenographies.
- 21 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 669; Bernini, 1999 (1713), 56–7.
- 22 From the *Gazette de France*, 19 January 1641. On *Mirame* see Bolduc, 2010.
- 23 Bolduc, 2010.
- 24 Sabbatini, ed. Povoledo, 1955, 128–9. On Bernini's brother's library, which included this book, see McPhee, 2000, 444, no. 35.
- 25 Furttenbach, ed. Hewitt, trans. Kernodle, 1958, especially 192–3, 234–9.
- 26 Trans. in Beecher and Ciavolella, 1985, 101, 102.
- 27 Act II, scene VI, in Beecher and Ciavolella, 1985, 102. On Bernini's theatre clouds see Carandini, 2001; on clouds in painting see especially Francastel, 1965, 211–38; Damisch, 1972; and Shearman, 1987. See Turchetti, 1996, on early modern theatre's cloud machines; and Buccheri, 2003.
- 28 Act II, scene I, in D'Onofrio, 1963, 60.
- 29 Avvisi di Roma, 5 March 1639, Modena, Archivio di Stato, Cancelleria Ducale, quoted in Hammond, 1985, 116.
- 30 Massimiliano Montecuccoli's letter to the Duke of Modena describing the 1637 performance is in Frascchetti, 1900, 262–3.
- 31 My analysis draws on Ludovico Zorzi's analyses of Renaissance theatre, notably 1977; the vast literature on Shakespeare's use of the 'play within a play'; as well as the art-historical literature on *Las meninas* and related scholarship on painting as mirror and as *trompe-l'œil*, notably Arasse, 1984; and Marin, 1978.
- 32 Massimiliano Montecuccoli to the Duke of Modena, 20 February 1637, in Frascchetti, 1900, 262–3.
- 33 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 56; Chantelou, 26 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001; and Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 668–9.
- 34 Giovan Battista Doni, quoted in Montanari, 2004b, 312; Montecuccoli to the Duke of Modena, 13 and 17 February 1638, in Frascchetti, 1900, 264–5.
- 35 For example, *I due accademie* (*The Two Studios*), described in letters from Zongo Hondedei, published in Saviotti, 1903, 72–4.
- 36 Act II, scene II, in D'Onofrio, 1963, 66.
- 37 See letter from Massimiliano Montecuccoli to the Duke of Modena, 13 February 1638, in Frascchetti, 1900, 264; Giovan Battista Doni, 'Theatralia', quoted in Montanari, 2004b, 312; Chantelou, 26 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 91; Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 668; and Bernini, 1999 (1713), 56.
- 38 Act III, scene I, in Beecher and Ciavolella, 1985, 103.
- 39 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 621. The passage is translated in Baldinucci, trans. Enggass, 1966, 40.
- 40 The classic statement of the artist's godlike power remains Kris and Kurz, 1979.
- 41 Ademollo, 1888, 106–8; Fagiolo, 1997; and Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a (1977), 460–3.
- 42 Furttenbach in Hewitt, ed., trans. Kernodle, 1956, 190, 193–4, 200–1, 212, 190.
- 43 Frascchetti, 1900, 264–5.
- 44 Giovan Battista Doni, quoted in Montanari, 2004b, 308.
- 45 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 56. See also Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 668.

- 46 Chantelou, 5 October 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 225–6.
- 47 Chantelou, 26 July and 7 October 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 92, 233–4. See also del Pesco, 2007, 81–4.
- 48 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 669.
- 49 Chantelou, 26 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 91.
- 50 See the letters by Zongo Hondedei in Saviotti, 1903, 72–4; and Giovan Battista Doni, quoted in Montanari, 2004b, 302–8.
- 51 Chantelou, 6 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 70–1.
- 52 Montanari, 2004b, 304, 311.
- 53 Chantelou, 13 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 117.
- 54 Frascchetti, 1900, 262–3.
- 55 Letter, 29 January 1633, published in Frascchetti, 1900, 108, note 1.
- 56 Giovan Battista Doni, quoted in Montanari, 2004b, 309.
- 57 Alpers, 1988; Montanari, 2003a, and 2007b, 36–51.
- 58 Chantelou's diary of Bernini's preparatory methods for carving the bust of Louis XIV relates how the artist drew the king in motion, rather than placing him in a still pose.
- 59 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 57.
- 60 Feigenbaum, 1993.
- 61 Bellori, 1976 (1672), 319; Malvasia, 1678, vol. 2, 13.
- 62 See Fumaroli's work on Jesuit rhetoric – for example, 1999; and O'Malley's anthologies on the Jesuits and the arts more generally, O'Malley et al., eds, 1999–2006; and O'Malley and Bailey, eds, 2005.
- 63 Grendler, 1989, 203–34.
- 64 Yates, 1983.
- 65 See especially Preimesberger, 1985 and 2011b; and Ostrow, 2007.
- 66 The commonly held historical schema is one of a development from the fixed stage sets of the High Renaissance to the increasingly dynamic set with moving parts of the seventeenth century. See especially Horn-Monval, 1957, who views the 1580s as the great period of mechanical innovation that gave impetus to the representation of movement on stage.
- 67 The term is Baxandall's, 1972.
- 68 Giovan Battista Doni, quoted in Montanari, 2004b, 303–4.

2 *Theatres of Piety*

- 1 Annibale Carracci, letter to Ludovico Carracci, from Parma, 18 April 1580, in Bottari and Ticozzi, eds, 1979, vol. 1, 120. On Annibale Carracci see most recently Robertson, 2008.
- 2 Summerscale, 2000, 95, prefers to translate 'macchina' as simply 'a vast and complex work'. This caution is judicious but risks losing the connection with technology that the term normally invokes, and thereby the association with theatrical machinery, which, to my understanding, lies behind the phrase. For a broader discussion of connections between Correggio's domes and theatrical cloud machines of the *sacre rappresentazioni* see Shearman, 1980 and 1987. For the centrality of the cloud motif to early modern art see Damisch, 1972.
- 3 On the *Quarant'ore* devotions see the fundamental articles by Weil, 1974a and 1992; and by Noehles, 1982, 1985b; see also Diez, 1997; Imorde, 1997 and 1998; and Petersen, 2012. On the motif of the glory see Hecht, 2003, especially 278–98 with reference to Bernini. On canonisation *teatri* see Noehles, 1985a; Boiteux, 1992; and Anselmi, 2005. On Catholic devotional practices in the Baroque see Forster, 2001; on the decoration of altars see Borromeo, 1577; and on the decrees of the Council of Trent concerning the doctrine of the Eucharist see Schroeder, trans., 1978; and Wandel, 2006. The classic literature on early modern Catholicism includes Evenett, 1968; Jedin and Dolan, eds, 1980; Dickens, 1992; Delumeau, 1995; and O'Malley, 2000; on the consequences for art see Mâle, 1932; and O'Malley, 1999.

- 4 See details of these in Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a, 270, 314–18, 320, 235–40.
- 5 On St Teresa see Lavin, 1980; Warma, 1984; Preimesberger, 1986; Napoleone, 1996 and 1998; Amidei, 1999; and Montanari, 2003b. See also Barcham, 2001, on details of its patronage. On the *Cathedra Petri* see Rice, 1997, 189–92, 265–71; Schütze, 1994, 1999 and 2008; Montanari, 2000; and Dombrowski, 2003. See also Lavin on the Crossing of St Peter's, 1968a; and Rice on the altars of new St Peter's, 1997. See Ackermann's discussion of Bernini's altar ensembles, 2007, including lengthy coverage of both the Cornaro chapel and the *Cathedra Petri*. While I have not discussed the different artists at work under Bernini in either of these projects, they are well documented and acknowledged in the secondary literature.
- 6 At the Cornaro chapel there was no Eucharistic reservation. My larger point is the relationship of church decoration and ritual to its liturgical focus, the celebration of the Eucharist.
- 7 Noehles, 1982 and 1985b; and Montagu, 1996.
- 8 See especially, Arasse, 1972; Shearman, 1987; and Chastel, 1993. See also Humfrey and Kemp, eds, 1990; and Rice, 1997, on the altarpiece more generally. On Correggio and the Parmese domes see Ekserdjian, 1997.
- 9 On the transmission of Bernini's sun machine from Rome to Paris see Chapter 1 note 19. Bernini became a member of the Jesuit *Congregazione dei Nobili* at the Gesù in 1640, further strengthening the suggestion of his involvement with this devotion so favoured by the Jesuit order. The pamphlet describing the display (Gerardi, 1640) is cited in Weil, 1974a, 244, no. 2; and Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a, 314–16.
- 10 Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a, 270.
- 11 Arasse, 1972; Damisch, 1972; Shearman, 1987; and Chastel, 1993.
- 12 Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a, 279–80.
- 13 Furttenbach, 1627, unpaginated.
- 14 Pozzo, 1693–1700.
- 15 Segneri, 1679, p. X. See Dombrowski's discussion of St Peter's as a figuration of the marvellous in spiritual terms, 2003.
- 16 From a vast bibliography see Wandel, 2006, on the Eucharist in early modern Europe; and Jungmann, 1950, on the order of the Catholic mass.
- 17 Biblical quotations from Norton, ed., 2005. See Kirsch, 1987, on the theology of clouds.
- 18 Rice, 1997, 190. On the Carolingian throne see Morello, ed., 1993, 165–6.
- 19 Schütze, 1994; Rice, 1997, 265–7; Montanari, 2000; and Ackermann, 2007, 179–219.
- 20 Rice, 1997, 267.
- 21 Lavin, 1980, gives full details of all parts of the chapel. See also the discussion in Ackermann, 2007, 43–54.
- 22 Peers, ed., 1946, vol. 1, 67, 80, 188; vols. 2, 143. Peers translated all of Teresa's spiritual writings, the *Obras de Teresa de Jesús* published in 1587, which are discussed also in Lavin's full analysis of the chapel, 1980.
- 23 Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 85–8. See Montagu, 1996, for examples of ornamental tabernacles.
- 24 Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Chig. D III 41, in Montanari, 2003b, 195, no. XII.
- 25 Povoledo, 1964; and Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 92–103.
- 26 Napoleone, 1998; and Carloni, 1999, give details concerning materials.
- 27 The translation of the hymn from the *Officia propria sanctorum, et aliarum festivitatum ordinis carmelitarum* is Lavin's, 1980, vol. 1, 116–17. See here also details of the institutionalisation of St Teresa's feast day.
- 28 See Careri's discussion of devotional 'conformation' in Bernini's chapel decoration, 1991.
- 29 Peers, ed., 1946, vol. 2, 201.

- 30 According to Nicodemus Tessin, as quoted in Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 104.
- 31 Napoleone, 1998, 181. My thanks also to Fabio Barry.
- 32 See Napoleone, 1998, 182, for discussion of the restoration that brought this to prominence. See also Carloni, 1999, 43. Borromini's letter is quoted in Napoleone, 1998, and Montanari, 2003b, 189.
- 33 See further Napoleone, 1998; and Carloni, 1999. My thanks also to Fabio Barry.
- 34 Peers, ed., 1946, vol. 2, 201, 205.
- 35 Panofsky, ed., 1946, 63.
- 36 This has been the subject of much scholarly discussion under the rubric of the 'bel composto' on which see especially Lavin, 1980; and Delbeke, 2006. On the vault specifically see also Amidei, Carloni and Tempesta, 1999; and Montanari, 2003b. For a broader discussion of the Baroque *trompe-l'œil* see Stoichita, 1997; and Marin, 2001.
- 37 Vandermoere, 1845. See the discussion in Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 116–18.
- 38 Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 1, 96–102. For a full account of the sources see Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a (1977), 241–7.
- 39 Described in Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a (1977), 245–7. See also the relevant essays on Jesuit theatre in O'Malley et al., eds, 1999–2006; and O'Malley and Bailey, eds, 2005.
- 40 Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 1, 101; Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a (1977), 241–7; Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 116–17.
- 41 Peers, ed., 1946, I, 192–3. The passage is central to Lavin's 1980 analysis, vol. 1, 107.
- 42 Peers, ed. 1946, vol. 1, 230–1, 270–1, 288. Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 113–18, gives an account of the sources describing Teresa's death.
- 43 Vandermoere, 1845, 310. The translation is Lavin's, 1980, vol. 1, 116–17.
- 44 See the many examples of Teresa's transverberation, in which she is pierced by an arrow, reproduced in Lavin, 1980, vol. 2, plates 263–88.
- 45 With regard to Bernini's chapels see especially Careri's discussion of 'conformation' in devotional practice, 1991; and Sommer, 1970. The psychoanalytic application of *jouissance*, as a longing for union with another to the point of loss of subjectivity, is Lacan's (especially 1972–3), who cites Bernini's *St Teresa* as well as the conventions of prayer of Catholic mysticism – also manifest in the poetry of St John of the Cross – as examples of desire's shattering of subjecthood.
- 46 On which see Mâle, 1932.
- 47 Santini, 1673, quoted in Perlove, 1990, 29–30, 37–44; and Careri, 1995, 67.
- 48 See the discussion in Montanari, 2003b, which publishes anonymous verse on the Cornaro chapel, discussed below. See also the poem published by Bernini's biographers: Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 616; and Bernini, 1999 (1713), 84. See also the four poems on St Teresa cited by Bauer, 1976, 85.
- 49 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 616; Bernini, 1999 (1713), 83–4.
- 50 Lavin, 1980; Warma, 1984; Preimesberger, 1986; Napoleone, 1996 and 1998; Amidei, 1999; and Montanari, 2003b.
- 51 Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana MS 4331. The text was published by Previtali, 1962; this trans. from Bauer, 1976, 53; also cited by Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 121, note 52.
- 52 Careri, 1991, discusses this in relation to the Albertoni chapel. See Feher, Naddaff and Tazi, eds, 1989, especially Tazi, for discussions of the role of the bodily within Catholic belief systems.
- 53 See Sommer, 1970; Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 121–4; Perlove, 1990; and Careri, 1991.
- 54 On the figuration of the affects within Catholic devotional cultures see especially De Blaauw, Gijsbers, Schütze and Treffers, eds, 1998.
- 55 On the history of representing Venus see Arscott and Scott, eds, 2000.
- 56 For the discussion of *incendium amoris* in relation to Bernini's art see Sommer, 1970; Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 123; Perlove, 1990; and Careri, 1995.
- 57 Damisch, 1980; and Montagu, 1994.
- 58 On this vast subject in early modern art and rhetoric see especially Fumaroli, 1982.

- 59 Chantelou, 6 June 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 46; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 15.
 60 See the fuller discussion of this in Chapter 4.
 61 Ignatius of Loyola, trans. Corbishley, 1979 (1524), for example 42, 47.
 62 Peers, ed., 1946, vol. 1, 54–5, 58.
 63 See, for example, Belting, 1990; Bynum, 1998 and 2007; Camille, 1989; and Hamburger, 1998.
 64 Bynum, 1998; and Mâle, 1932.
 65 Freud, 1975 (1930); Lacan, 1998; and Kristeva, 2008.
 66 Peers, ed., 1946, vol. 1, 110–11.
 67 Peers, ed., 1946, vol. 2, 384.
 68 Peers, 1987, for example, p. 28, stanza 22; p. 31, stanza 1.
 69 Hugo, 1624, plate 32. See Sommer, 1970, 36; Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 123; Perlove, 1990, 26; and Careri, 1995, 55.
 70 See especially Warburg, 2000; Didi-Huberman, 2002a and 2002b; Careri, 2003.
 71 See the anonymous and previously unpublished cache in the Vatican published by Montanari, 2003b, 194–7; see also the verse in Silos, 1678, 189, trans. in Bauer, 1976, 85.
 72 Lavin, 1980, vol. 1, 100–1.
 73 See the Introduction, note 1.
 74 Letter from Lelio Guidiccioni, June 1633, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. Lat. 2958, fols 202–207v, partially published by D’Onofrio, 1967, 381.

3 *Pastorals*

An earlier version of this chapter was published as ‘Speaking Statues: Bernini’s *Apollo and Daphne* at the Villa Borghese’, *Art History*, 27/3 (June 2004), pp. 352–81, and I am grateful to the Association of Art Historians for granting me permission to re-elaborate this material here.

- 1 Quisquis amans sequitur fugitivae gaudia formae,
 Fronde manus implet, baccas seu carpit amaras.

On the construction of the base see Faldi, 1954, 34–7; Hibbard, 1958; and Herrmann Fiore, 1997a, 98–101. On a Renaissance culture of inscriptions see Vuilleumier, 1987; and Petrucci, 1993 (1980).

2 On the Villa Borghese, its collections and grounds in the time of Scipione Borghese see Kalveram, 1995; Flemming, 1996; Gaddo, 1997; Coliva and Schütze, eds, 1998; Campitelli, ed., 2005; and Herrmann Fiore, 2008. See also the early guidebooks to the villa by Manilli, 1650; and Montelatici, 1700; as well as the early twentieth-century catalogues by Longhi, 1928; Faldi, 1954; and della Pergola, 1955–9.

3 See Bolland, 2000, for a useful recent summary of interpretations of *Apollo and Daphne* and a discussion of its literary sources. The reopening of the Villa Borghese produced a plethora of publications concerning the work, of which see especially: Herrmann Fiore, ed., 1997b; Coliva and Schütze, eds, 1998, 252–75; and Coliva, ed., 2002, 184–207. From the extensive secondary literature on the sculpture Kenseth, 1981; Preimesberger, 1989; Warwick, 2004; and Kruse, 2006, are particularly pertinent to this discussion.

4 Baldinucci’s account of the inscription’s genesis, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 592, is usually deployed to support this thesis, as well as the inscription itself.

5 Usefully summarized in Bolland, 2000. On the literary myth of Apollo and Daphne see Giraud, 1969; and Barnard, 1987. See also Stechow’s broad-ranging discussion of its representation in the arts, 1932.

- 6 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, vol. 5, 592, relates that ‘all Rome ran to see this miracle’.

7 See Fumaroli, 1988, on the epigram and its use within elite art criticism of the period.

8 On the culture of conversation see: Fumaroli, 1988; Goldsmith, 1988; Fumaroli, 1992; and Burke, 1993a. On the role of conversational mores in early modern Italian art criticism see Warwick, 2000, 76–129.

9 Hagstrum, 1958, 17–36.

10 Chantelou, 12 June 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 57; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 30–1.

11 Baldinucci, ed. Ranalli, 1974, vol. 5, 592.

12 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 19–20.

13 Cureau de La Chambre, c.1685, 20; published in Montanari, 1999, 123.

14 See Wittkower, 1997 (1955), 238, cat. no. 14; and Lavin, 1968b, on de Sourdis's patronage of Bernini. The dating of the visit to view *Apollo and Daphne* has, in fact, proved difficult, causing some scholars to doubt the details of the account. Hibbard, 1958, 182, suggests that it took place between August and October 1622 on the basis of documentary evidence. This is difficult to reconcile with other evidence that suggests de Sourdis had left Rome by July 1622. It has even been suggested that Bernini misremembered the name of his visitor (Bolland, 2000, 327, note 48).

15 See D'Onofrio, 1967, 307, on evidence that the verse was composed before the sculpture. Winner, 1985 and 1998c; and Preimesberger, 1989, discuss the variance between the details of Pluto and Proserpina in Maffeo's poem and in Bernini's sculpture to argue that the sculpture is no mere illustration of the patronage group's text. Further documentary evidence published in D'Onofrio, 1967, 56–7, substantiates that Maffeo did make visits to the Villa Borghese in the company of men of letters.

16 Ovid, Book I, 451–569, trans. Raeburn, 2004, 28–33.

17 Bolland, 2000, treats extensively the connection between Petrarchan poetry and Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne*. See also Noferi, 1974; and Sturm-Maddox, 1985, on Petrarch, desire and a Petrarchan reception of Ovid.

18 Marino's treatment of the theme was extensive. The story figures in his *La sampogna*, *Rime sparse* and *La galleria*. He also wrote works entitled *Dafne*, *Trasformazione di Dafne* and *Dafne in lauro*. A connection between Bernini's sculpture and Marino's verse was first put forward by Frascchetti, 1900, 417, which has spawned much reworking; see especially Kenseth, 1981; Preimesberger, 1989; and Bolland, 2000, 309–30, for a full discussion of Marino's inversion of Petrarchan absence in relation to Bernini.

19 Ovid, Book I, 416–50, trans. Raeburn, 2004, 26–7. On imitations of and the taste for the *Apollo Belvedere* see Haskell and Penny, 1981; Beck and Schulze, 1989; and Winner, 1998b.

20 On Venus as prototype see especially Arscott and Scott, eds, 2000.

21 This point was made by Preimesberger, 1989. From the extensive literature on Roman villa gardens see especially Gaddo, 1997; Campitelli's various publications, especially 1994 and 2010, on the Villa Borghese grounds; and Ehrlich on Borghese holdings, 2002. See also Coffin, ed., 1972; Coffin, 1979 and 1991; Benes and Harris, eds, 2001; and more generally Ackerman, 1990. See also Hughes, 1994, on antique landscape.

22 On Scipione's acquisition of works by Caravaggio see Wązbiński, 1989. On Caravaggio's early works see the recent catalogue raisonnée, Schütze, 2009.

23 For a Christological interpretation see Calvesi, 1990; seconded by Zuccari, 1984; and Marini, 1987. The position is a predominantly Catholic one. For a homoerotic interpretation see Posner, 1971. Hibbard, 1983, further developed this thesis. It has been refuted, most recently in English, by Gilbert, 1995. See also Warwick, 2006a.

24 Bellori, 1976 (1672); Martin, 1965; Posner, 1970; Fumaroli, 1988; Dempsey, 1995; and Ginzburg, 2000 and 2008.

25 First suggested by Tietze, 1906–7. See Dempsey, 1968.

26 Martin, 1965, 82, pointed out the musical connection; Dempsey, 1995, makes the most complete statement concerning the room's function as an art gallery.

27 On the seventeenth-century virtuoso see Houghton, 1942a and 1942b. See the *Oxford English Dictionary* for etymological definitions of the word 'delight' that encompass connotations of allure and desire.

28 On the position of the papal nephew see Menniti Ippolito, 2002, especially 145; on Paul V and Scipione see Reinhard, 1974; and Reinhardt, 1984. On Scipione and the Borghese more generally see Borghese, 1954. On his art and architectural patronage see Antinori, 1995; and Coliva, 1998.

29 On the collection of antiquities see the catalogue of a recent exhibition at the Galleria Borghese, Coliva, ed., 2011. On the eighteenth-century redecoration of the villa see Paul, 2008. See Herrmann Fiore, 2008, for a recent discussion of Scipione's sculpture collection, with an emphasis on the villa façades and the antiquities. See also Kalveram, 1995.

30 On the Palazzo Borghese see Fumagalli, 1994.

31 Haskell, 1980, 27–8.

32 The notion of delight, which is directly applicable to Scipione, clearly touches on those of wonder and the marvellous, on which see especially Greenblatt, 1991; Kenseth, ed., 1991; and Impey and MacGregor, eds, 2001. With reference to Marino see also Mirollo, 1963. On early modern collecting as a form of delight see Warwick, 2000. See also the discussion of the villa's collecting as centred around concepts of *urbanitas*, or urbane Roman hospitality, in Herrmann Fiore, 2008, which converges on the reading given here. In her survey of previous interpretations of the decorative schema for the façade, Herrmann Fiore concludes that all of these may stand as readings, while she posits her own, more encompassing concept of *urbanitas* in an argument similar to that made here.

33 See Coliva, 1998.

34 According to the diary for 1645 of the travelling Englishman, John Evelyn (Evelyn, 1959 (1641–1706), vol. 2, 253).

35 Evelyn, 1959 (1641–1706), vol. 2, 261.

36 See the interesting discussion of memory and presence in the gallery visit by Robson, 2006.

37 On the *Hermaphrodite* see most recently Winner, 1998a. On documentation surrounding the piece see Roani Villani, 1993, 37–40; and Kalveram, 1995, 119–22.

38 Letter from del Monte, 5 July 1619, Florence, Archivio Statale Firenze, Carteggio d'artisti III, ins. 7, cc. 26–7. Quoted in Roani Villani, 1993, 45–6; and Winner, 1998a (in Coliva and Schütze, eds, 1998), 130, 431.

39
 Duplicem formam
 Uno in corpore vides
 Mirare pulchritudinem.
 Duplex cor uno in pectore
 Saepe invenies
 Cave insidias.

For a historical analysis of hermaphroditism in early modern Europe see Daston and Park, 1996.

40 On the wooden support and cover for the piece see Kalveram, 1995, 231; reproduced in Coliva, ed., 2002, 133–8. Winner, 1998a, suggests that the inscription from the Susini copy may have also been made on the wooden support for the marble. Manilli's guidebook to the collection, 1650, 72–3, relates that the sculpture was displayed on a wall facing windows, under which was a seat with a leather mattress similar to the one Bernini had carved and from which visitors might view the recumbent nude.

41 The analysis here draws on Dollimore, 2001; and Preimesberger, 1998, 217. Dollimore's discussion centres around Hegel's description of pleasure as both attraction and repulsion.

42 Warwick, 2006a.

43 Tesauro, 2000.

- 44 See Winner, 1998c, for complete bibliography.
- 45 On the representation of rape see Tomaselli and Porter, eds, 1986; Higgins and Silver, eds, 1991; Wolfthal, 1999.
- 46 Quisquis humi pronus flores legis,
inspice saeve me Ditis ad domum rapi.
- The translation is from Winner, 1985, 194.
- 47 On the loggia fresco see Winner, 1985; and Ficacci, 1998a.
- 48 This inscription is known from Manilli, 1650. See the translations in Coffin, 1991; and Herrmann Fiore, 2008, 220–1. Della Pergola, 1955–9, vol. 1, 13, attributed the verse to Maffeo Barberini. For discussion of possible copies in the Vatican Museums and the Victoria and Albert Museum, or indeed the lost original of the marble slab, see Gaddo, 1985, 105, note 41; and Herrmann Fiore, 2008, 241, note 21.
- 49 Marin, 1992b.
- 50 From the scholarly literature on pastoral as a literary genre see especially Williams, 1973; and Patterson, 1987. My analysis of the role of time draws on anthropological studies by Leach, 1961, and Gell, 1992. On the pastoral with reference to collecting see Stewart, 1984.
- 51 Francucci da Imola, 1613, dedication.
- 52 Evelyn, 1959 (1641–1706), vol. 2, 253, diary for 1645.
- 53 On the pastoral play see especially Zorzi, 1985; on pastoral opera see Leopold, 1991; and McClary, 2002 and 2004.
- 54 Giovan Battista Doni, quoted in Leopold, 1991, 85.
- 55 See the literature cited on villa entertainments above, especially Gaddo, 1985.
- 56 Gaddo, 1985; and Campitelli, 1994.
- 57 On Scipione's banquets see Leporeo, 1628, fol. 8r–v. Ehrlich, 2002, 320, note 97, cites references in the *avvisi* to dinner parties accompanied by music and followed by a hunt in the grounds and the performance of a comedy.
- 58 Doni, 1566.
- 59 From the large literature on Italian villas and their gardens see Ackerman, 1990; Coffin, 1979 and 1991; the extensive writings of Lionello Puppi on Palladio (for example, Puppi, 1999); Dixon Hunt, ed., 1992; and Benes and Harris, eds, 2001.
- 60 On Italy's early modern academies see especially Yates, 1983; and Quiviger, 1995, for their relationship with art. See Ehrlich, 2002, for details of Scipione's ties with the Accademia degli Umoristi. On verse by a member of the Umoristi pertaining to Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne* see Bellini, 2006, 281.
- 61 Bruni, 1633, 34, trans. in Bellini, 2006, 282 and note 30.
- 62 From the biography of Maffeo Barberini by Andrea Nicoletti, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. Lat. 4730, fol. 371, quoted in D'Onofrio, 1967, 56.
- 63 Erythraeus, 1645, vol. 2, 127–30, quoted in Ferrari, 2004, 61; and Ehrlich, 2002, 182, 358 note 110. Erythraeus was the pen name for Giovanni Vittorio Rossi, who was critical of Guidiccioni's abilities in the capacity of guide to the collection, as Ferrari points out.
- 64 Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. Lat. 2077, cited in D'Onofrio, 1967, 307.
- 65 Marino, 1619; on which see Fumaroli, 1988.
- 66 For example, G. Demisiani, 'Discorso sopra quattro statue del Cardinale Borghese', c. 1600, Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Fondo Borghese, II, 468, fols 43–66; and L. Leporeo, 'Villa Borghese', 1628, Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Fondo Borghese, I, 425bis. See also Castagnetti, 1993, who discusses Lelio Orsi's *Caprarola*, a sequence of 240 Latin epigrams which, following the itinerary of a visit to Villa Caprarola, take their point of departure from individual objects therein; and Maffeo Barberini's *Poemata* (1620), consisting of twenty epigrams dedicated to statues, fountains, paintings and painters, some of which can

be traced to Caprarola and the Farnese context.

67 I thank Kristina Herrmann Fiore for allowing me to read her paper on Francucci da Imola's cantata, which she delivered at a conference on Bernini at the National Gallery of Scotland in 2009. On opera's 'ballo delle statue' see Heller, 2010.

68 Francucci da Imola, 1613, fol. 7, canto primo: 'Le figure, e le statue della Corte'. On the poem see Donati, 1977; and Herrmann Fiore's forthcoming edition of the manuscript.

69 Francucci da Imola, 1613, fols. 6v, 28.

70 Francucci da Imola, 1613, fol. 8:
 tu solo Apollo puoi di mille Apelli
 L'apre muti adeguar con nobil canto,
 E con la penna tù de i lor penelli
 Dipinger puoi l'intera gloria, el vanto.
 Tu puoi l'opre avviar de gli scarpelli,
 E per solo anch'io confido intanto
 Pittor canoro, et scultor loquace
 Dar vivi accenti à chi parlando tace.

71 Leporeo, 1628, trans. in Herrmann Fiore, 2008, 232.

72 See Alberti, 1972 (c.1440), 5–7, on the mythic origins of sculpture as trees. On the early modern preoccupation with metamorphosis as part of a culture of wonder see Barkan, 1986.

73 According to Passeri, 1934 (1772), 247, much of the detailed work was done by Bernini's assistant, Giuliano Finelli, on which see Montagu, 1985; Dombrowski, 1997; and Bacchi, 2009. See also Cole, 2007, for a discussion of Bernini's transformation of the supporting struts into narrative-illusionistic elements of roots and leaves.

74 I owe this observation to Pardo, 1993. Bolland's analysis, 2000, pursued a similar dualism of vision and touch based on literary sources. On Bernini's quest for lifelikeness see further the observations on the rendering of eyes in Boudon-Machuel, 2004.

75 See Preimesberger, 1985 and 2011b; Ostrow, 2004 and 2007; and the catalogue of the exhibition 'I marmi vivi: Bernini e la nascita del ritratto barocco' held at the Bargello, Florence, in 2009, Bacchi et al., eds, 2009, especially the essay by Montanari (Montanari, 2009).

76 De Brosse, 1986, vol. 2, 44, letter XXXIX. On the illusion of soft flesh rendered in marble as a sculptural topos established by Bernini see Cousinié, 2002.

77 Raguene, 1700, 37–9.

78 See the technical reports in Herrmann Fiore, ed., 1997b, 139–69; and in Coliva, ed., 2002, 184–207.

79 As Bolland, 2000, emphasised in her study of Bernini's literary sources.

80 The analysis draws heavily on McClary, 2002 and 2004; and Chafe, 1992.

81 See Strinati and Bernardini, eds, 1999; and Coliva, ed., 2002.

82 Chantelou, 6 June 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 47; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 16.

83 Preimesberger, 1985 and 2011b; and Ostrow, 2004 and 2007.

84 See Soussloff, 1989, on Bernini's dialogue with Michelangelo. From the analyses of technical reports see Rockwell in Herrmann Fiore, ed., 1997b, for an emphasis on Bernini's rethinking of sculptural techniques; Coliva and Schütze, eds, 1998; and Coliva, ed., 2002.

85 Chantelou, 12 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 116. See the discussion in Herrmann Fiore, 1997b, 95–8, 152.

86 See the technical reports in Herrmann Fiore, ed., 1997b, according to rugosymmetrical measures.

87 As noted by Preimesberger, 1989, 121.

88 Winner, 1998b.

89 On the *paragone* and the display of art works see Robertson, 2008.

90 On the decoration of the façade see Coliva, 2008. On the theme of ancients and moderns with regard to the villa, and its collections and decoration see Winner, 1985,

191–207; Calvesi, 1996, 14–41; Coliva, 1998; and Ficacci, 1998a. See also the related discussion by D’Onofrio, 1967, 216–24, of the Villa Borghese as political allegory for Borghese rule as the restoration of a golden age.

91 Francucci da Imola, 1613, fols 7–8.

92 On the restoration of antiquities in the seventeenth century see the seminal discussions by Rossi Pinelli, 1986; and Montagu, 1989, 151–72. See, specifically, Roani Villani, 1993, 37–51; and Carracciolo and Zatti, 1997. On Cordier see Pressouyre, 1984.

93 Mancini, ed. Marucchi, vol. 1, 1956, 7.

94 Mancini, ed. Marucchi, vol. 1, 1956, 9.

95 Mancini, ed. Marucchi, vol. 1, 1956, 144–5.

96 Nicolas Poussin letter to the statesman and patron François Sublet de Noyers, ed. Blunt, 1964, 143; and Ottonelli and Berrettini, 1973 (1652).

97 Wittkower, 1934, 327, first made a case for relief composition and one-point viewing, which he further propounded in his 1955 book on Bernini (Wittkower, 1997 (1955), 100–3) and his general book on sculpture, 1977, 167–71. See also Hibbard, 1965, 45–8, 55–7. For a different approach that argues for a multiplicity of viewing points from side through frontal to side see Kenseth, 1981; and Kruse, 2006.

98 Chantelou, 26 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 91–2.

99 As illustrated in a document of measurements for the base dated 15 March 1625, published in Hibbard, 1958, 181–3.

100 The observation is Herrmann Fiore’s, 1997a, 100.

101 Manilli, 1650, 70. A document about the transport of *Apollo and Daphne* to the Villa Borghese describes it as originally placed in ‘the room near the stairs’, published in Hibbard, 1958, 183, along with evidence about its placement next to the wall.

102 See Herrmann Fiore, 1997a.

103 Waddy, 1990. Coliva and Schütze, eds, 1998, 270, indicates substantial numbers of documents of payment for moving sculptures around in the villa.

104 This point is made most eloquently by Kenseth, 1981.

105 Manilli, 1650, 70.

106 Evelyn, 1959 (1641–1706), vol. 2, 254.

107 Francucci da Imola, 1613, fol. 55. On the painting see cat. no. 16 in Gregori, ed., 1991, 282–8.

108 Kris and Kurz, 1979, 80, discuss the close relationship between automata and lifelike art. Treatises on automata from the period include Baldi, 1601; and Branca, 1629. On the automaton more generally see Droz, 1958. See Bredekamp, 1995, for a discussion of the automaton within early modern collections; and Jacobs, 2005, 185–98, for discussion of the Renaissance automaton’s surrogacy.

109 On early modern humour see especially Bakhtin, 1984; Findlen, 1990; and Burke’s 1997 discussion of the practical joke as ‘work of art’.

110 On automata in early modern Italian court culture see Portoghesi, 1965; within Roman collections see especially Daston and Park, 1998; and Findlen, 2003. My thanks to Alex Marr for sharing his knowledge of automata with me.

111 Adorno, 1967 (1955).

112 See, for example, Kuspit, 1992.

113 Stewart, 1984. See also Baudrillard, 1968; and Duncan, 1995.

114 Balducci, 1681, 181.

115 Pliny, *Naturalis historia*, Book XXXIV, 58, Book XXXVI, 99, quoted in Sutherland Harris, 1992. See also the discussion of the open mouth in Cousinié, 2002.

116 Poussin, ed. Blunt, 1964, for example, 40–1, 62, 117, in which painting is compared to music or to the sounds of words in poetry. See also Fumaroli, 1982 and 1994; and Marin, 1995.

117 See Christiansen, 1990; and Camiz, 1988.

118 The reference to the *Laocoön* in Proserpina's pose and facial expression would have been stronger in Bernini's time because an early modern restoration of the *Laocoön*'s (lost) back arm had set this limb in a pose that Proserpina's echoes.

119 See the citations in Kenseth, 1981, 200–1.

120 Chantelou, 4 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 154.

121 I owe this observation to Martin Kemp. My thanks also to Wendy Heller for her consideration of it.

122 See Careri, 2003; Bertozzi, ed., 2002; and Cieri Via, Montani and Cestelli Guidi, eds, 2004.

4 *Fountain and Festival*

1 On this model see most recently Fagiolo, 2006, 200–7, especially 202. See also Frascchetti, 1900, 206; Bernardini and Fagiolo dell'Arco, eds, 1999, 375–81, nos. 108–117, especially 112; and Millon, ed., 1999, 105, 446–8, especially no. 68. D'Onofrio, 1986, 416–20, note 31, disputes the autograph status of the model.

2 See especially Courtright, 1981; and Sutherland Harris, 1990, on the preparatory stages of work for the fountain.

3 On the *Fountain of the Four Rivers* see especially Frascchetti, 1900, 179–206; Wittkower, 1999 (1958), 268–70; Preimesberger, 1974; D'Onofrio, 1986, 395–439; Fagiolo, 2006, 200–7; Fehrenbach, 2008; and Warwick, 2012b.

4 Other scholars to have suggested this include: Sutherland Harris, 1990; Fagiolo, 1999; and Fehrenbach, 2008. On the early modern festival in Rome see especially Carandini and Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1977–8; Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997b; and the seminal articles by Boiteux, 1992 and 2004; and Torniai, 1986 and 1991.

5 Werner and Zimmermann, 2002.

6 On the place of the *bozzetto* within early modern sculptural practice see especially Dent Weil, 1978; Montagu, 1986; and Gaskell and Lie, eds, 1999. Dent Weil and especially Hemingway, in Gaskell and Lie, eds, 1999, address the practicalities of scaling up from models to full-scale works with particular reference to Bernini.

7 The Bologna model was apparently donated to Bologna's Accademia Clementina. Of wood and clay, it is not a complete model, the obelisk and part of the base having been lost. The height of the fountain's base that it represents and the length of the remaining river god are of similar proportions to the earlier Giocondi model. See Zamboni, 1968, who discovered the model in an academy storeroom.

8 In addition to the above see Cipriani, 1987, on the lion. See also the forthcoming catalogue for the exhibition of Bernini's preparatory models at the Metropolitan Museum of Art and Kimbell Art Museum, 2012.

9 Frascchetti, 1900, 180; followed by Brinckmann, 1923–5, vol. 2, 40; Sestieri, 1970, 13; and Sutherland Harris, 1990, 494. Brauer and Wittkower, 1931, 48–9, however, place this model at a later stage, followed by Steven Ostrow in his catalogue entry in Millon, ed., 1999, 447, cat. no. 68.

10 Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 616–17, trans. Enggass, 1966, 36.

11 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 85–6.

12 Undated letter from Francesco Mantovani, Modena, Archivio di Stato, Cancelleria Ducale, quoted in Frascchetti, 1900, 180, note 2.

13 Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze, MS III.II.110, fol. 47, quoted in D'Onofrio, 1986, 406.

14 Frascchetti, 1900; Sestieri, 1970, 13; and Brauer and Wittkower, 1931, place the Giocondi-Forti model later in date, followed by Steven Ostrow in Millon, ed., 1999, 447. For a recent summary see Petrucci, 2004, 73–75 and notes.

15 On gift exchange in art see Warwick, 1997, and 2000, 55–75. See Petrucci, 2004, for a discussion of the various models and copies. There is a gilt bronze version in the Royal Collection in Madrid, rightly seen as a copy after the fountain, possibly by Bernini's hand. It has been suggested that it was brought to Spain by the great Spanish collector in Italy the Marqués del Carpio, as a gift from the Colonna to the Spanish crown; alternatively that it was a gift from Cardinal Giulio Rospigliosi to Philip IV c.1665. See Ruiz, 2003, and Fagiolo, 2006, 204. Haskell, 1980, 191, note 2, found evidence concerning yet another small version belonging to del Carpio in Naples. Fagiolo, 2006, 204, cites a silver miniature that was to have been given to Louis XIV by Pope Clement IX; Montagu, 1996, 4, and 214, note 24, notes the presence of such a silver model in the French Royal Collection. Cesare d'Onofrio found a further instance of a silver model in the seventeenth-century collections of the House of Savoy, and Charles Avery, 2002, 196, mentions a (now lost) silver model belonging to Cardinal Mazarin, possibly given to him by the artist himself; see D'Onofrio, 1986, 418, note 31, on both these models. Further, an inventory of the collection of Bernini's heir, Prospero Bernini, lists three models as having come down to him from the artist: 'Inventario dei beni ereditari della bo. Me. Cavalier Prospero Bernini ad istanza della Signora Concetta Caterina Bernini in Galletti', 19 May 1858, Ariccia, Palazzo Chigi Archives, quoted in Petrucci, 2004, 83, note 9.

16 On Baroque statuettes in semi-precious metals see especially Montagu, 1996; and Bewer, 1999, with specific reference to Bernini.

17 As many scholars have noted, the design of the fountain represented on the first of these medals is closer to the Giocondi-Forti model than to the final work, indicating that it was rendered c.1649. Further medals of the fountain were struck in subsequent years. See Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), 409–10; Giancarlo Alteri's catalogue entry in Bernardini and Fagiolo dell'Arco, eds, 1999, 380, cat. no. 116; and Steven Ostrow's catalogue entry in Millon, ed., 1999, 448–9, cat. no. 76.

18 See especially Preimesberger, 1974; D'Onofrio, 1986, 395–439; and Fagiolo, 2006, 200–207.

19 For example, Iversen, 1968; Preimesberger, 1974; Rivosecchi, 1982; and Fehrenbach, 2008, all suggest Kircher as an advisor. See also Rowland, 2001, for a discussion of Kircher's influence on the underlying hydraulics of the fountain. On Kircher more generally see most recently Findlen, ed., 2004.

20 On Lualdi's writings on the *Fountain of the Four Rivers* see Huse, 1970; on Lualdi's artistic commentary more generally see Delbeke, 2004b.

21 Christian, 1986; D'Onofrio, 1986, 395–400. On Lualdi's writings on the *Fountain of the Four Rivers* see Huse, 1970.

22 See especially Romano, 1939–42; Salerno, Spezzaferro and Tafuri, 1973; Ackerman, 1982; Krautheimer, 1982; Tafuri, 1984 and 2006; Ingersoll, 1985; Mignot, 1999; Antinori, 2008. For general histories of the city square see Zucker, 1959; and Webb, 1990.

23 On the development of Piazza Navona see the local histories by de Gregori, 1926; Romano, 1939–42; Montanelli, 1970; Ravaglioli, 1973; and Romano and Partini, 1987. See also San Juan, 2001, 187–218; and Warwick, 2006b, 2009, and 2012. On the church of Sant'Agnese see Eimer, 1970–1; and Simonetta, Gigli and Marchetti, 2003. On Palazzo Pamphili see Leone, 2008.

24 Innocent's edict of 6 June 1651 proclaimed that the piazza was no longer to be cluttered with the impediments and rubbish of a market, but to be enjoyed for its beauty, free of vendors and their wares, Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, Bandi e Editti, Per. Est. 18/7, 1650–1655. An *avviso* from Francesco Gualengo to Mantua, 10 June 1651, relates that 'per render [la piazza] più riguardevole sono usciti i bandi che commandono il levare di mezzo tutti gli imbarazzi delle bottegucchie, e coperti, che prima la tenevano in buona parte occupata', quoted in Frascchetti, 1900, 186, note 4.

25 See Tafuri, 1976, and 1992; and Warwick, 2012b. There are prominent case studies on Piazza Farnese (École Française de Rome, 1981–94); on the Capitol (Capitoline Museums,

1991); and on Piazza del Popolo (Ciucci, 1974); as well as the famous study of via Giulia by Salerno, Spezzaferro and Tafuri, 1973.

26 Modena, Archivio de Stato, Cancelleria Ducale, Carteggio Ambasciatori, AE Roma, 261, quoted by Jarrard, 2003, 174 and note 18.

27 The term 'teatro' is abundant in source material for the period. In the secondary literature see Krautheimer, 1985.

28 See further Warwick, 2012b.

29 Lefebvre, 1991 (1974); and Warburg, 1999.

30 On the ritual displays attending Innocent's accession see Carandini and Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1977, vol. 1, 131–7; and Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a, 149–51 and 329–37.

31 On fireworks see Salatino, 1997.

32 Fagiolo dell'Arco 1997a, 149–66, 329–37, especially 149. Within festival decoration, these motifs would seem to have been generic: for example, a series of festival cars named after the four continents for a Medici festival of 1564 included decorations composed of four reclining river gods on a mount, one of them combined with obelisks, for which see Huse, 1970, 90.

33 Fehrenbach, 2008, 95.

34 Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a.

35 Tafuri, 1992.

36 See especially Noehles, 1985a. On Bernini's architecture more generally see Marder, 1998; and Borsi, 2000 (1980).

37 Zorzi, 1977.

38 Briganti, 1962.

39 Mumford, 1961, 344–409; and Visceglia, 2002a and 2002b.

40 Chastel, 1956.

41 Boiteux, 1977, 1992 and 2004; and Visceglia, 2002b.

42 Yates, 1956 and 1972; Nora, 1989; and Nora, ed., 1998.

43 Visceglia, 2002b. See also McGowan, 2002. On the history of the early modern Catholic church see O'Malley, 2000.

44 The analysis draws on the dualism of Kantorowicz's analysis of the king's two bodies, 1957, on which, with regard to the papacy, see Prodi, 1987; and in connection with funerary rituals see especially Carandini, 1978; and Visceglia, 2002b.

45 The event was described in many *relazioni*, *avvisi* and diaries: for example, those of Vitale Mascardi, Ludovico Bentivoglio, Giulio Arrigucci and Giacinto Gigli. See Montanelli, 1970, 100; and Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a, 285–8.

46 Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 2, 585–6. For sources on this festival see Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997a, 349–52.

47 On Bernini's poetic reception see Frascchetti, 1900; Ferrari, 1997, 1999 and 2004; and Montanari, 1998b. On the poetic reception of the *Four Rivers* fountain specifically see also Cancellieri, 1811; and Montanari, 2003b.

48 Lualdi, 1651a, quoted in Huse, 1970, 13.

49 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 88; Balducci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 617–18.

50 See the discussion in Montanari, 2003b.

51 For example, de Gioya, 1651, whose title declares its content: *Copiosissimo discorso della Fontana e guglia eretta in Piazza Navona . . . con un abbondante dichiarazione de' quattro fiumi . . . lo loro origine, quanto si dilation . . . e molte alter cose non men curiose che dilettevoli concernenti a detti fiumi piante ed animali, come minutissimamente si descrivono I gesti che fanno detti animali*. See also Lualdi, 1651a, quoted in Huse, 1970; and Ascione, 1651, quoted in Frascchetti, 1900, 200–1.

52 Preimesberger, 1974.

53 Gombrich, 1966; and Barasch, 1987.

54 See Barasch's related discussion of covered hands, 1987; and Deckers, 2010, on the motif of the veiled head in Baroque sculpture.

- 55 Frascchetti, 1900, 181.
- 56 Lairesse, 1707, where the gesture is illustrated. See the related discussion of acting manuals by Smart, 1965, 93.
- 57 See Le Brun in Jouin, 1883. On Le Brun's theory of the passions see especially Damisch, 1980; and Montagu, 1994.
- 58 On Bonifacio see Knox, 1996.
- 59 On the extent of Cortona's involvement with Ottonelli on this treatise see Noehles, 1970, 365–7; and Sparti, 1997, 89–103.
- 60 Bacon, ed. Spedding, Ellis and Heath, vol. 3, 1857, 400.
- 61 Bulwer, 1974.
- 62 Scholarly literature on gesture encompasses the anthropological, psychological, physiological, and semiotic, as well as the historical and art-historical, and theatre studies. From this gamut see, in addition to the notes above, especially Hécaen, 1971; Burke, 1993b; Chastel, 2001; Pollock, 2003; Kendon, 2004; and Careri, 2005.
- 63 Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 2, 533.
- 64 On Rome's obelisks see especially Iversen, 1968 and 1993; Rivosecchi, 1982; D'Onofrio, 1992; and Curran, Grafton, Long and Weiss, 2009.
- 65 Quoted in D'Onofrio, 1986, 426.
- 66 Torniai, 1986 and 1991; Boiteux, 1992 and 2004; Fagiolo, ed., 1997; Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1997b.
- 67 Lualdi, 1651a, quoted in Huse, 1970, 13.
- 68 Quoted in Montanari, 2003b, 192.
- 69 Meli, 1652, quoted in Frascchetti, 1900, 199.
- 70 See the catalogue entries for this painting in Bernardini and Fagiolo dell'Arco, 1999, 380–1, cat. no. 117; and Millon, ed., 1999, 449, cat. no. 75 by David R. Marshall. The painting remained with Bernini's heirs until 1967, which suggests that it was a gift to the artist to mark the completion of the fountain. Because the artistic merit of the work is minor it has been treated as an object of purely historical interest, a visual document of the fountain's completion. In fact it is not a literal report of a specific event. The cortège represented is acknowledged as too minor and informal to be the papal parade that marked the fountain's official opening. It has been linked to an apparently impromptu papal visit to the fountain just before its opening as recorded by Bernini's biographers. Yet the fountain would still have been under work tents at that time, and was not yet functioning, whereas the painting depicts it free from their protection and with water already flowing through it.
- 71 Nora, 1989; Nora, ed., 1998; Yates, 1972; and Halbwachs, 1980.
- 72 See Perry Anderson's history of political absolutism, 1974. See Skinner, 1978; and Giesey, 2004, on early modern political theories of divine-right rule. See also Asch and Birke, eds, 1991; and Adamson, ed., 1999.
- 73 Rome, Biblioteca Lincei e Corsiniana, Cod. Corsiniana 167, fols 107–119v. See the discussion of this manuscript and its relationship to the inscriptions of the fountain in Huse, 1970; and D'Onofrio, 1986, 426, note 40. On the fountain's inscriptions see Iversen, 1968, 87–8.
- 74 Kircher, 1650, unpaginated introduction.
- 75 Leporeo, Rome, Biblioteca Lincei e Corsiniana, Cod. Corsiniano 169, carte 21, published in Frascchetti, 1900, 199.
- 76 Citations in Romano and Partini, 1987, 127–30; and Montanari, 2003b, 190–3.
- 77 My analysis here draws on Stewart, 1984; and Mitchell, 2002a.
- 78 These were of course completely rewritten by Jean-François Champollion in the nineteenth century, who decoded the hieroglyphs as a straightforward dedicatory inscription to the Emperor Domitian.
- 79 Kircher, 1650. See Iversen, 1968; Rivosecchi, 1982; and Marder, 2000. On early modern conversational texts see also Fumaroli, 1992; and Warwick, 2000, 76–129.
- 80 Montanari, 2003b, 193.

81 Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 2, 661, 1652: ‘l’acqua . . . formava un lago sopra la terra, et serviva per spasso delle carrozze, che vi passavano sopra’. See also the discussion in Fagiolo dell’Arco, 1997a, 151–2.

82 See Lotz, 1973, on carriages in Rome and the consequences for urban development. See also Krautheimer, 1985, pp. 15–36.

83 See Rinne, 2010, for a general discussion of water and fountains in Baroque Rome.

84 Fagiolo dell’Arco, 1997a, 151–3; and Fagiolo, 1999, 143–4, and 2006. See also Rivosecchi, 1982.

85 On the medal see Ostrow’s catalogue entry in Millon, ed., 1999, 448–49, cat. no. 76; and the entry in Bernardini and Fagiolo dell’Arco, eds, 1999, 380. For a discussion of this reading of the fountain see Fehrenbach, 2008, 150, using texts relating to the fountain by Lualdi, Virgilio Spada, and Kircher’s pupil Filippo Bonnani.

86 On the history of the fabrication of the *Moro* see Avery, 2002, 18–22.

87 Anderson, 1983, 21; Mitchell, 2002a; Marx, 1983 (1887), vol. 1, 76–81.

88 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 89–91; Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 619–20.

89 *Avviso* from Francesco Gualengo to Mantua, 14 June 1651, quoted in Frascchetti, 1900, 190, note 1.

90 ‘Registro dei maestri delle strade’, Rome, Archivio di Stato, vol. 449, fol. 106, 1646. See Romano and Partini, 1987, 73–111, 120.

91 Ameyden, ‘Diario’, vol. 2, November 1647, July 1648; Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 2, 528–34. See also Romano and Partini, 1987, 120–1; and Warwick, 2006b.

92 *Avviso* from Francesco Gualengo to Mantua, 14 June 1651, quoted in Frascchetti, 1900, 190, note 1. Similarly, Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 2, 631–2, describes the unveiling of the fountain on 8 June 1651, and the reaction of those working in the market.

93 Edict of 6 June 1651, Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, Bandi e Editti, Per. Est. 18/7, 1650–1655. See the *avviso* from Francesco Gualengo to Mantua, 10 June 1651, quoted in Frascchetti, 1900, 186, note 4. Rossi, 1928, discusses bands and edicts relating to prohibitions regarding fountains.

94 Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 2, 631, June 1651: ‘per passaggio delle carrozze’. Ameyden, ‘Diario’, vol. 3, July 1648: ‘senza alcun utile al pubblico’.

95 Connors, 1989; Nussdorfer, 1992; Fantoni, 2002; and Fantoni, Gorse and Smuts, eds, 2009.

96 École Française de Rome, 1981–94, vol. 1; and Averett, 2006.

97 The classic study is Lefebvre, 1991. See also, especially, Harvey and Soja, 1989; Rose, 1993; and Hayden, 1995.

98 The notion of the reinvention of tradition comes from Hobsbawm and Ranger, eds, 1992 (1983).

99 The analysis here draws especially on Boiteux’s work on festival forms, 1977, 1992 and 2004; Kertzer, 1988; and Visceglia, 2002a and 2002b.

100 Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 2, 435–6. See Visceglia, 2002b, on the reinvention of the *posse*.

101 See note 22 on the local histories of Piazza Navona.

102 From an extensive literature on Carnival see especially Ademollo, 1883; Clementi, 1899; Boiteux, 1977; Ayala and Boiteux, eds, 1988; and Rak, 1997.

103 Lefebvre, 1991; Rose, 1993; and Deutsche, 1996. See also Harvey and Soja, 1989.

104 From the vast literature on this subject see, with reference to this discussion, Visceglia and Brice, 1997. See also Kertzer, 1988; Houseman and Severi, 1998; and Durkheim, 2009 (1912).

105 On the political ideology of absolutism see Skinner, 1978; and Giesey, 2004. See Prodi, 1987, on the political representation of papal power; and, most recently, Antinori, 2008. On the representation or semblance of effortless mastery within early modern cultures see the literature around the reception of Castiglione and later courtesy literature, notably Burke, 1995; and Stanton, 1980.

106 On Pasquino and pasquinades see Silenzi and Silenzi, 1968; Marucci, 1988; D’Onofrio, 1990, 25–56; Rendina, 1991; Arzone, 1995; Giovanni, 1997; Damianaki, Procaccioli and Romano, eds, 2006. With reference to Bernini see Lavin, 1981a and 2007; and Warwick, 2006b and 2009.

107 The folkloric strand of Rome’s urban anthropology has been fully chronicled by D’Onofrio, 1990. On Pasquino’s literary heritage see, in addition to the above, Barkan, 1999, 210–30.

108 The translation is from Lavin, 2007–, 444.

109 See Deutsche, 1996, for discussion of graffiti and space.

110 Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 2, 533–4, August 1648. Frascchetti, 1900, 182, records Francesco Mantovani’s *avviso* to the Duke of Modena of 18 July 1648, containing some of the same critical verse.

111 Gigli’s diary gives much information on the social reception of the renovation of Piazza Navona, especially 1994 (1608–44), vol. 2, 534. Romano and Partini, 1987, 111–36, give a full account of the renovations of the piazza and reactions to them.

112 The Roman *avvisi* are also an important source for pasquinades. ‘Obeliscum hoc in for Agonis sumptibus innocentium Innocentius aeternitati consecravit’ was recorded by the Modenese agent Francesco Mantovani in his *avviso* of 18 July 1648, Modena, Archivio di Stato, Cancelleria Ducale.

113 Frascchetti, 1900, 186–90, gives archival details of this papal band, and of resistance to it. See also Nussdorfer’s discussion of market regulation, 1992, 118–27; and San Juan’s discussion of the fountain’s mixed reception, 2001, 199–207, 295–6.

114 Romano and Partini, 1987, 124; Gigli, 1994 (1608–44), vol. 2, 631.

115 Romano and Partini, 1987, 123–4.

116 On the *commedia dell’arte* see Lea, 1934; and Richards and Richards, 1990. See also Katritzky, 2006.

117 Chronicled by Gerardi, 1644. The first publication of the poems, edited by Mazzocchi, 1510, describes the costume and backdrop for Pasquino. See also Besso, n.d.; Silenzi and Silenzi, 1968, 12–18, 107; Rendina, 1991, 15–39; and Barkan, 1999, 210–30. D’Onofrio, 1990, 38–40, discusses costumes and backdrops for Pasquino.

118 See Montagu, 1989, 151–72, on Baroque ‘restorations’ of antiquities.

119 On the origins of the pasquinades see Gnoli, 1890; and Rendina, 1991.

120 For the sources on this play see D’Onofrio, ed., 1963, 93–6.

121 Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 663–4; Chantelou, 8 June 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 53.

5 The Performance of Practice

1 Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 589–90; Bernini, 1999 (1713), 10–11. On the court reception of the sculptures see the catalogue entry by Anna Coliva in Coliva and Schütze, eds, 1998, 276–89, cat. nos 29–30; and most recently by Catherine Hess in Bacchi, Hess and Montagu, eds, 2008, 187–8, cat. no. 41.

2 The phrase ‘calculated spontaneity’ comes from Lavin, 1978. My point in using it here is to draw together Bernini’s practice with early modern courtly notions of *sprezzatura*, as devised by Baldassare Castiglione in his *Il cortegiano* (*The Book of the Courtier*).

3 Other famous examples include the *Fountain of the Four Rivers*, where Bernini turned the water on as the pope was leaving having said the hydraulics were not yet ready; and the angels for the Ponte Sant’Angelo, of which Bernini carved additional versions in secret to appease the pope’s concerns for the effects of weathering on the marble. Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 619–20; Bernini, 1999 (1713), 90–91, 159.

4 There is an extensive literature on varied aspects of Bernini's artistic practice. Wittkower 1997 (1955), 193–6; and Borsi, 2000 (1980), 270–7, give an overview. See especially Coliva, ed., 2002.

5 On drawings Brauer and Wittkower, 1931, remains fundamental, as well as Lavin, ed., 1981b. See also Sutherland Harris, 1977. On terracotta models see Lavin, 1967 and 1978; Gaskell and Lie, eds, 1999; Sigel, 1999 and 2002; and Boucher, ed., 2001. For an overall discussion see Coliva, ed., 2002.

6 See especially Weil, 1974b; Montagu, 1989; and Kirwin, 1997.

7 Wittkower, 1997 (1955), 193–6; Preimesberger, 1985; and Ostrow's summary of the literature, 2004, 329. See also McPhee, 2000, on Bernini's brother's library.

8 Montanari, 2007a, 36–51, 164, based on documents in Aronberg Lavin, 1975, 5.

9 On Roman portrait busts see Grisebach, 1936. On Bernini's development of the portrait bust tradition see Zitzlsperger, 2002; and Bacchi, Hess, Montagu, eds, 2008. See also Boudon-Machuel, 2004.

10 The chief source is Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001. On Chantelou's diary as a source see del Pesco, 2007. See also the anthology by Schneider and Zitzlsperger, eds, 2006, on Bernini's trip to Paris and Chantelou's account of it, especially Zitzlsperger's discussion of the bust of Louis XIV, 397–414. Chantelou's account is amplified and corroborated by the correspondence of other Italians at the French court, including Bernini's assistant Mattia de' Rossi, much of which was published in the twentieth century: by Frascchetti, 1900, 337–56, who published *avvisi* from Paris in the Archivio di Stato, Modena; by Mirot, 1904, who published letters between Rome and Paris from Bernini's friends, found in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS Ital. 2083; and by Schiavo, 1956, who published correspondence and news reports from Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, fondo Nunziatura di Francia, cartella 125, and Sebastiano Baldini's 'Relazione . . . Chigi in Francia', Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Chigiani, E. II. 38. Montanari, 1998a and 1999, has done further research on the sources in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MSS Ital. 2082–84, which he has identified as a collection made for the purposes of biography; see also Cureau de La Chambre, c. 1685, ed. Montanari, 1999. On Mattia de' Rossi see Menichella, 1985. See also the memoirs of Perrault on Bernini's presence in Paris, 1993 (1755), 147–88. For Colbert's memoranda in response to Bernini's plans for the Louvre see Clément, 1861–82, vol. 5, 245–6, 258, 501; and Depping, 1850–5, vol. 4, 535–8, 548–9. Most recently, see the appendices in Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001, 345–408, which reproduce much of the above material translated into French.

11 Wittkower, 1951; Wittkower, 1961 for a study of Bernini's equestrian monument of Louis XIV; Gould, 1982; Lavin, 1993; and Careri, 1995. On issues of cultural exchange in early modern Europe see Calabi and Christiansen, eds, 2007; and with reference to Bernini's relationship with the French court, Warwick, 2009.

12 As raised by Clark, 1992, in relation to a different set of issues and contexts.

13 Wood, 2005.

14 Hughes, 1990; and Lukehart, ed., 1993, 11–17. Cole and Pardo, eds, 2005, 1–35, see the term *studio* as largely anachronistic for this period, although interestingly there are references to this term in the Bernini sources: for example, Carlo Cartari's diary, 19 November 1665, Rome, Archivio di Stato di Roma, fondo Cartari-Febei, vol. 81, fol. 264, which mentions 'che si entra nella camera terrena, che chiama il suo studio'.

15 Alpers, 1988 and 2005.

16 Elias's study of court society, 2006, remains fundamental to the literature. See also Asch and Birke, eds, 1991; Diundam, 1994; and Adamson, ed., 1999. With specific reference to the early modern artist see Warnke's classic study, 1993 (1985); for an earlier period see especially Welch, 2004.

17 The question of Bernini's position as a court artist is also raised by Montanari, 2004a.

18 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 148–9.

19 For Sperling's account see Rooses, 1910.

20 Cole and Pardo, eds, 2005.

- 21 Montagu, 1989, 107.
- 22 Mormando, 2011a, 24–6.
- 23 On Rubens's house and especially on his collection see Muller, 1989; on Cortona's house see Sparti, 1997. On Bernini's family home see D'Onofrio, 1967, 122–9; on his house in via delle Mercede see Borsi, Acidini Luchinat and Quinterio, eds, 1981. See the inventory of Bernini's belongings, 27 January 1681, made after his death, Rome, Archivio di Stato di Roma, Not. A. C. Mazzeschus, Istrumenti, busta 4246, fols 499r–513v), published in Martinelli, 1996, 253–9.
- 24 Chantelou, 6 June 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 48; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 18–19 and note 30.
- 25 Acidini Luchinat, 1981.
- 26 Tessin, 'Osservazioni dal discorso del Sig. or Cav. ro Bernini', published in Kommer, 1974.
- 27 Sandrart, 1925, 286. Sandrart described these models as made of wax, testimony which some scholars have doubted on the basis that none have survived. However, Alexander VII's diary clearly establishes that Bernini did make wax models for his portrait of this pontiff, 5 and 15 July 1657, as published by Krautheimer and Jones, 1975, 205–6.
- 28 Chantelou, 17 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 123.
- 29 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 15–16.
- 30 Acidini Luchinat, 1981.
- 31 Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 602.
- 32 On Bernini's donation of presentation drawings see Montanari, 1998a, especially 267–75. On early modern culture's gift exchange of works of art more generally see Warwick, 1997, and 2000, 55–75.
- 33 Krautheimer and Jones, 1975.
- 34 See Montanari, 1998a, in his discussion of Bernini's 'continua pratica', especially 355.
- 35 Pommier, 1998, 15, 276. On the casting of relations between artist and patron in terms of friendship more generally see Cropper and Dempsey, 1996.
- 36 Krautheimer and Jones, 1975, 205–6.
- 37 Letter from Mattia de' Rossi, 26 June 1665, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Ital., fol. 95, published in Mirot, 1904, 217, note 1; this and other letters pertaining to Bernini's trip to France are also published in French translation as an appendix to Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001, 388; see also Bernini, 1999 (1713), 135.
- 38 For a discussion of the very different conditions of early Renaissance artists working for courts see Welch, 2004.
- 39 Carlo Roberti de' Vittori, journal, 26 June 1665, Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, fondo Nunziatura di Francia, cartella 130, fol. 579, published in Schiavo, 1956, 33.
- 40 Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001, 170, 9 September 1665.
- 41 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 19, 138.
- 42 Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 670.
- 43 Laurain-Portemer, 1981–97, vol. 2, 293–310; Montanari, 1997, and 1998a, 344–5, 379; and Delbeke, 2000, 2004 and 2005.
- 44 Noted in Quinterio, 1981, 13–38.
- 45 Mormando, 2011a, 97; Bernini, 1999 (1713), 105, 107. Chantelou, 10 September 1665, records a conversation, in which it was claimed the pope had visited Bernini's house ten times, ed. Stanić, 2001, 172.
- 46 Chantelou, 19 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 80–1.
- 47 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 592–3; Chigi's and Testi's letters were reproduced in Frascchetti, 1900, 351, 108. See also Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 593. For a general discussion of court protocol see Elias, 1994.
- 48 Mattia de' Rossi, letter, 26 June 1665, see note 36.

49 See Preimesberger, 2000. Warnke, 1993, discusses the valued ‘calculated spontaneity’ of court culture, for which see Lavin, 1978, with reference to Bernini. See also the discussion of Bernini’s reported aphorisms in Delbeke, 2000.

50 Chantelou, 3 October 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 219.

51 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 98. The artist’s concerns over his studio arrangements in Paris arise in Chantelou, 6 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 108; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 105 and note 34; Blunt cites Weil, 1974b, 133, on an entry in Carlo Cartari’s diary, 19 November 1665, noting that Bernini did not object to being watched at work as long as he was apprised beforehand, Rome, Archivio di Stato di Roma, fondo Cartari-Febei, vol. 81, fol. 264.

52 For discussion of the early modern court artist see Warnke, 1993 (1985).

53 Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 587; Bernini, 1999 (1713), 8–9.

54 Chantelou, 20 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 195; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 216 and note 171.

55 Letter from Lelio Giudiccioni, June 1633, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. Lat. 2958, fols 202–207v, partially published in D’Onofrio, 1967, 380–8; see also Schütze, 1998, 248–50; and Zitzlsperger, 2002, 179–83.

56 On Bernini’s caricatures in general see especially Lavin, 1981a and 1990. See also Brauer and Wittkower, 1931, vol. 1, 180–4, vol. 2, 146a, for the caricature of Scipione Borghese; and Sutherland Harris, 1975.

57 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 28; Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 657–8.

58 Orsini, 1648, 63, 65.

59 Chantelou, 10 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 172–3; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 187–8.

60 However, another passage from Chantelou reveals that Bernini could use his caricatures to tame those who stood in his way: finding it difficult to gain access to Louis XIV owing to the constant fanfare of his court at all their sittings, Bernini apparently said ‘I have a good mind to make a caricature of one of them’, a comment that the French courtiers fortunately did not understand; see Chantelou, 19 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 127.

61 Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 660; and Bernini, 1999 (1713), 104. See Settis, 1992, p. xviii; and Montanari, 1998a, 353–4, and 2003a, 194; their readings of the incident broadly agree with mine, although with some differences. The biographies vary slightly in their accounts, as Montanari states.

62 In the eyes of his enemies such as G. B. Passeri, Bernini was effectively artistic dictator, on which see Sutherland Harris, 1987. Beyond the individual artist, the story would seem to touch on the issues at stake in the sixteenth-century *paragone* debate, on the relative merits of painting and sculpture, on which see Preimesberger, 1985. This may be understood in terms of competing claims for the prince’s preferment at court, as Warnke, 1993 (1985), commented, and was generally considered to have been resolved in favour of painting, because it involved less hard physical labour and mess. In Bernini’s case, however, he upended this so successfully as to become the pope’s effective artistic minister. Warnke’s comments highlight its social dimension in addition to the artistic issues that have received more attention in the case of Bernini.

63 Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 657.

64 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 19, 50.

65 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 19, 48; Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 657.

66 On the many layers within these sources see especially del Pesco, 2002; and Montanari, 2006.

67 On Bernini’s *parere*, or critical judgement, in an architectural context see Marder, 1999. On connoisseurship in the period more generally, which many artists practised on behalf of their patrons, see Warwick, 2000, 76–129.

68 Chantelou, 27 September and 4 October 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 207, 220–1; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 231, 250–1 and notes 27–9.

- 69 Chantelou, 25 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 88–9; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 80.
- 70 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 30. Baldinucci and Chantelou also record this story, see Chantelou, 6 June 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 47. The analogy is also reported by Stone, 1918, 171; and Vertue, 1930, 19. For a further discussion see Warwick, forthcoming. On Bernini and the *paragone* more generally see especially Preimesberger, 1985 and 2011b; Lavin, 1998a and 1998b; and Ostrow, 2004 and 2007.
- 71 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 149.
- 72 Chantelou, 14 October 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 259, documents Bernini's visit to see a collection of wax portraits in Paris, which he purportedly liked very much, although Chantelou also relates that he thought them of value mainly within a family circle; it is difficult to tell to what extent this is Chantelou's 'correction' of Bernini's judgement. On the Florentine tradition of wax sculpture see Düring, 2006; and on wax portraits more generally see Schlosser, 2008.
- 73 Cureau de La Chambre, 26, ed. Montanari, 1999, 126.
- 74 Chantelou, 6 June and 12 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 47, 115; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 16, 115. On the technical rendering of eyes see Boudon-Machuel, 2004.
- 75 Published in Michel, 2002, 97.
- 76 Published in Kommer, 1974, 158–61.
- 77 Stone, 1918 (1638–42), 171, entries for 22 October and 11 December 1638.
- 78 Wittkower's classic statement argues for a practice-based, craftsmanlike way of teaching, 1997 (1955), 195. Preimesberger, 1985, saw Bernini's *Martyrdom of St Lawrence* as informed by the *paragone* debate, arguing for Bernini's awareness of the theoretical foundations of his art. The two are not, of course, mutually exclusive in an early modern context. See also Bandera, 1999.
- 79 Pascoli, 1730–6, vol. 1, 322–3, with reference to Mattia de' Rossi and others.
- 80 Dialogue between Guidiccioni and Bernini, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. Lat. 3879, fols 45–54v, published by D'Onofrio, 1966.
- 81 Much is published in Frascchetti, 1900. See again Montanari's discussion of Bernini's 'fortuna poetica', 1998b.
- 82 Quoted in Frascchetti, 1900, 108.
- 83 For an encyclopedia of Italian academies from the fifteenth century to the nineteenth see Maylender, 1976. On definitions of the term 'academy' in the fifteenth century see Hankins, 1991, 433–6. On early modern scientific culture see Findlen, 1994.
- 84 *Vocabolario degli accademici della Crusca* (Florence, 1612).
- 85 Yates, 1983, 6–29. See also Quiviger, 1995, 105–12. On French conversational culture see, for example, Magendie, 1925; and Fumaroli, 1992; on Italian art-critical conversational culture see Warwick, 2000, 76–129.
- 86 Montanari, 2003a, drawing on Alpers's analysis of Rembrandt.
- 87 See Lukehart, ed., 1993, especially Feigenbaum, 1993; and de Grazia, 1995.
- 88 Chantelou, 9 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 168–71.
- 89 Chantelou, 20 and 21 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 128–33; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 132–6 and notes. See Montanari's treatment of Bernini's 'fortuna poetica', 1998b, especially 130–1 and note 10.
- 90 Chantelou, 19 September 1665, Stanić, ed., 2001, 189; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 208–9. Baldinucci and Domenico Bernini also cite the verse in question, although the verse first appeared in La Chambre's eulogy to Bernini.
- 91 Cureau de La Chambre, c.1685, 21–2, ed. Montanari, 1999, 124.
- 92 Chantelou, 19 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 189; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 209.
- 93 Chantelou, 20 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 128–9; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 132.

94 On the cultural fabrication of Louis XIV's image see Apostolidès, 1981; and Marin, 1988b (1981). See also Pommier, 2003; and Henry, 2007, on the role of the court artist in the king's image-making.

95 Beecher and Ciavolella, 1985, 63–114, which gives a facing English translation of the Italian manuscript. The play was first published in D'Onofrio, 1963, under the title of the folder in which it was found in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS 2084, as the manuscript is in fact without a title. Beecher and Ciavolella credit Lavin with the suggestion of the title *The Impresario*, which describes well the subject of the play. Passeri's 1772 life of Guidobaldo Abbatini, an apprentice of Bernini's, describes how Bernini put on a play for Carnival in his room at the Vatican foundry, while he was working on the *Baldachin*, using himself, his brother Luigi and his students as actors.

96 Chantelou, 6 July and 2 October 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 70–1, 218; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 53–4, 247.

97 Cited in two letters from Abbot Zongo Hondedei, first published in Saviotti, 1903, 71–3; and in Fagiolo dell'Arco and Fagiolo, 1967, scheda 67; and Montanari, 2003a, 193.

98 Passeri, 1772.

99 See Chapter 1 for discussion of Bernini's plays and the involvement of his studio in dramatic performances.

100 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 54–5, trans. in Lavin, 1981a, 37; see also Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 667.

101 See Montanari, 2003a, who pursues the issue in relation to Bernini's self-portraits.

102 Chantelou, 29 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 96; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 89.

103 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 15.

104 Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 591; Bernini, 1999 (1713), 19.

105 Chantelou, 14 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 76; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 60 and note 49. In this regard, see also Montanari's discussion, 2003a, of Bernini's self-portraits, a genre that involves working from the self as model.

106 Vatican City, BAV Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. Lat. 2958, ccfol. 202–207v, partially published in D'Onofrio, 1967, 380–8; and Schütze, 1998.

107 On the open mouth see Sutherland Harris, 1992.

108 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 20.

109 On the techniques deployed for rendering these effects see the excellent discussion in Coliva, ed., 2002, 217–33.

110 See Brauer and Wittkower, 1931, vol. 1, 29–30; Harris, 1977, p. xvi, cat. no. 28; Weston-Lewis, ed., 1998, 47–50; and Bacchi, Hess and Montagu, eds, 2008, 169, cat. no. 3.6.

111 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 15.

112 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 133–4; Vatican City, BAV Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. Lat. 2958, ccfol. 202–207v, partially published in D'Onofrio, 1967, 380–8; and Schütze, 1998, 248–50.

113 Wittkower, 1997 (1955), 286–7; Gould, 1982, 42–5; and Erben, 2004, 108–20. Their accounts are based on the written sources, as no drawings or clay models have come to light for the bust of Louis XIV.

114 Lavin, 1967, 102–4, and 1981b, 4–5.

115 Chantelou, 12 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 115; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 115. On the portrait '*sur le vif*' as a conceptual category, both as a means of working and as an effect, see Didi-Huberman, 1994, although this pertains to an earlier period, with different issues.

116 Chantelou, 16 June, Stanić, 2001, 59.

117 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 133–4; letters by Mattia de' Rossi, 5 and 26 June 1665, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Ital. 2083, fol. 353, and MS Ital. fol. 95, published in Mirot, 1904, 206 n. 3, 217 n. 1. See also Chantelou, 27–28 June, 12, 19, 29, 30 July, 12 August 1665, ed.

Stanić, 2001, 65, 75, 81, 96, 98, 115–16. The literature on Bernini's portraiture, including his preparatory methods, is extensive; for a survey see Wittkower, 1997 (1955), 88–119; Lavin, 1968b; Boucher, 1998, 57–88; and Weston-Lewis, ed., 1998, 64–79.

118 From the recent technical reports connected with the reopening of the Galleria Borghese see especially Coliva, 1999. See also Herrmann Fiore's discussion, 1997a, of the technical evidence.

119 Chantelou, 29 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 95–6; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 89; Félibien, 1671. See Lavin, 1998a, 34–52, for a discussion of early modern political theory relating to the heroic prince and its classical antecedents.

120 The literature on early modern court cultures is vast. In the context of this discussion see especially Elias, 2006 (1969); Eamon, 1991; and Biagioli, 1993. The quote by Bernini is reported by Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 669.

121 Chantelou, 21 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 131; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 135.

122 Chantelou, 27 June 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 65; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 43–4. See also Preimesberger's discussion of the exchange, 2006; and Warwick, 2000, 74, for discussion of the portrait as 'furto e dono' in another context.

123 Chantelou, 10 and 19 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 172–3, 187; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 188.

124 Chantelou, 14 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 119; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 119. On the culture of early modern connoisseurship and connoisseurial modes of viewing see Warwick, 2000, 76–129.

125 Coliva and Schütze, eds, 1998; Coliva, ed., 2002.

126 Schütze, 1997.

127 Montanari, 1997, and 1998a, 344–5, 379; Laurain-Portemer, 1981–97, vol. 2, 293–310. See also Delbeke's work on Bernini's relationship with Pallavicino, Delbeke, 2004a.

128 Based on Perrault, 1993 (1755).

129 Lavin, 1993, understands the relationship between king and artist as one of mutual admiration; Stanić, in his commentary to the edition of Chantelou, 2001, presents the opposite point of view.

130 Baldinucci, ed. Ranelli, 1974, vol. 5, 593, trans. Enggass, 1966, 15. Bernini, 1999 (1713), 24.

131 Chantelou, 12 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 115–16; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 115–16.

132 Perrault, 1993 (1755).

133 Chantelou, 10, 19 and 25 September 1665, ed. Stanić 2001, 172, 187, 201.

134 Chantelou, 15 August 1665, ed. Stanić 2001, 120; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 121.

135 Chantelou, 19 August, Stanić, 2001, 128; Corbett trans., ed. Blunt, 1985, 131.

136 Félibien, 1671, 87–88, 105. See Apostolidès, 1981; and Marin, 1988b (1981).

137 Letter from Mattia de' Rossi, 26 June 1665, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Ital., fol. 95, published in Mirot, 1904, 217, note 1; and in French translation in Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001, 388; see also Bernini, 1999 (1713), 135; Chantelou, 22 and 29 July, and 19 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 82, 95, 128; and Elias, 2006.

138 Chantelou, 9 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 168; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 181–2. See also Lavin's discussion of Bernini's *paragone* portraits, 1999; and Bodart, 2006, 51–4, on the king's forehead.

139 Chantelou, 3 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 152; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 162.

140 Chantelou, 30 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 214; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 241.

141 Letter from Giovanni Battista Muzzarelli to Cardinal Rinaldo d'Este in Modena, 6 October 1668, published in Jarrard, 2002, 418.

142 Tessin records this as a constant in Bernini's process; published in Kommer, 1974, 159.

143 In their analyses of Louis XIV and royal absolutism, Apostolidès, 1981; and Marin, 1988b (1981), both draw on the medieval ideology of the king's two bodies, one physical, the other symbolic of the state.

144 Chantelou, 15 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 120; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 121.

145 Chantelou, 4 June and 8 October 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 45, 237; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 12, 270.

146 Letter from Mattia de' Rossi, 26 June 1665, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Ital., fol. 95, published in Mirot, 1904, 217, note 1; and Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001, 388; see also Bernini, 1999, 135; and Chantelou, 29 July 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 96; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 89.

147 Chantelou, 15 August and 25 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 148, 120. See the discussion in Lavin, 1993, 161, of Alexander references contained within the bust.

148 Chantelou, 19 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 190; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 210–11 and note 156.

149 Chantelou, 29 July and 19 August 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 95–6; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 88, 131.

150 On the rich and varied understanding of the portrait form in the early modern period see Pommier, 1998; and 2004. See also Gentili, Morel and Cieri Via, eds, 1993, and especially Zerner, 1993, on the 'effects' of resemblance.

151 Letter from Carlo Roberti de' Vittori, 2 October 1665, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, fondo Nunziatura di Francia, fol. 841v, published in Schiavo, 1956, 42.

152 Chantelou, 28 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 209; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 234 and note 231.

153 Chantelou, 26 September 1665, ed. Stanić 2001, 205; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 228–9.

154 Plutarch, *Life of Alexander*, trans. Maidment, 1971.

155 Chantelou, 17 August 1665, ed. Stanić 2001, 123; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 125 and note 113.

156 Wittkower coined the phrase 'speaking likeness' to describe Bernini's portraiture; see Wittkower, 1951, 7. See Hess, 2009, for a full discussion.

157 Félibien, 1671, 102–3, published in Marin, 1988b (1981), 212.

158 Chantelou, 29 September 1665, ed. Stanić 2001, 123; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 239 and note 253. Voltaire, 1966 (1752), 1, 310, describes the event, quoted in Marin, 1988b (1981), 13.

159 On the ideologies of absolutism see the classic study by Anderson, 1974. On the history of king and parliament in seventeenth-century France see Tilly, 1986; and Ranum, 1993. On the fashioning of royalist ideologies in early modern France see Giesey, 2004.

160 Letter from Jean-Baptiste Colbert, 1664, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS It. 2083, 323, cited in Bandera, 1999, 71.

161 On scale and presence in royal portraiture see Stoichita, 1986.

162 Chantelou, 4 September 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 154; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 165.

163 On the panopticism of the king's regard see the recent essays Sabatier, 2007; and Jollet, 2007. Jollet also discusses the fear mingled with fascination and desire felt by those who regarded the king.

164 Chantelou, 5 October 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 223–4; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 254. Bernini also discussed the fixing of the pupils on 12 August: Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001, 115; evidently these earlier marks were provisional, and were revised on 5 October. See also Preimesberger's discussion of the episode, 2006, 209–10.

165 See Apostolidès' discussion of the king's ocular authority, 1981, 47, 74–5, which cites Pierre Le Moyne's *De l'art de regner* (1665) and Géraud de Cordemoy's *De la réformation d'un état* (1668) for their discussion of the 'ordering' power of the king's gaze, the centre on which all gazes converge and also the defining gaze that places his subjects 'in perspective'.

166 Baldinucci, 1681, 181, who cites 'Paggi and others' as his source for this definition. On Bernini's carving of eyes more generally see the pioneering article by Boudon-Machuel, 2004.

167 First noted by D'Onofrio, 1967, 266, and recently discussed by Herrmann Fiore, 1997a, 90–1. See also the more cautious discussion in Coliva, 1999, 9.

168 Letter from Lelio Giudiccioni, June 1633, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Barb. Lat. 2958, fols 202–207v, partially published in D'Onofrio, 1967, 380–8; see also Schütze, 1998, 248–50; and Zitzlsperger, 2002, 179–83.

169 For differing interpretations of its collocations see Lavin, 1993, 186; and Stanić, 2004, 175.

170 For a full discussion see Warwick, 2012a.

171 Chantelou, 12, 13 and 14 October 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 251–61; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 290–301. A Monsieur d'Albon touched on France's great cultural debate of the period, that of *anciens et modernes*, saying he would have preferred the bust without a collar, like the heroes of antiquity; Chantelou persuaded him that Frenchmen should not copy the Romans and Greeks but appear in the fashion of their own time. This position of depicting the king in contemporary dress in portraiture was also to be put forward by Charles Perrault, *La peinture* (1668).

172 Bernini, 1999 (1713), 116, relates that there was a secret clause of this treaty specifically concerned with Bernini. In his edition of Chantelou, 2001, 13, Stanić, points out that there is no other evidence for this but suggests that the general practice of appeasing the French by sending them an artist they had long coveted may still apply.

173 Letter from Mattia de' Rossi, 26 June 1665, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Ital. fol. 95, published in Mirot, 1904, 217, note 1; and in French translation in Chantelou, ed. Stanić, 2001, 388. Chantelou also refers to this, 20 June 1665, and to a prior knowledge of the king's intention to ask Bernini to carve his portrait, 11 June 1665, ed. Stanić, 2001, 61, 55; trans. Corbett, ed. Blunt, 1985, 38, 28.